



Concordia Theological Monthly



A P R I L

•

1 9 5 1

Concordia Theological Monthly

Published by The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY
ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Address all communications to the Editorial Committee in care of
the Managing Editor, F.E. Mayer, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis 5, Mo.*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

PAUL M. BRETSCHER, RICHARD R. CAEMMERER,
THEODORE HOYER, FREDERICK E. MAYER, LOUIS J. SIECK

CONTENTS

FOR APRIL 1951	PAGE
THE AUTHORSHIP OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. <i>Hugo Odeberg</i>	225
THE TEMPTATION OF THE CHURCH: A STUDY OF MATT. 4:1-11. <i>J. J. Pelikan, Jr.</i>	251
THE LOTTHERS: FORGOTTEN PRINTERS OF THE REFORMATION <i>W. G. Tillmanns</i>	260
SERMON STUDY ON ISAIAH 6:1-8	265
THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER	275
BOOK REVIEW	294

Francisco, Clyde T.: Introducing the Old Testament. — *Heidel, Alexander*: The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels. — *Callaway, T. W.*: Christ in the Old Testament. — *Allis, Oswald T.*: The Unity of Isaiah. — *Way, Arthur S. (translator)*: The Letters of St. Paul to Seven Churches and Three Friends with the Letter to the Hebrews. — *Little, C. H.*: Explanation of the Book of Revelation. — *Elert, Werner von*: Das christliche Ethos. — *Henry, Carl F. H.*: Fifty Years of Protestant Theology. — *Carnell, Edward J.*: The Theology of Reinhold Niebuhr. — *Schlink, E., et al.*: Evangelisches Gutachten zur Dogmatisierung der Leiblichen Himmelfahrt Marias. — *Sangster, W. E.*: The Craft of Sermon Illustration. — *Kennard, J. Spencer, Jr.*: Render to God. A Study of the Tribute Passage. — *Calhoun, Arthur Wallace*: The Cultural Concept of Christianity.

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., to which all business correspondence is to be addressed.

\$3.00 per annum, anywhere in the world, payable in advance.

Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 5, 1918.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

nod

re of
Mo.

HECK

AGE

225

251

260

265

275

294

The
the
S.
the
—
of
uhr.
hen
—
—

ing
nce

for
17,
S. A.

Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. XXII

APRIL 1951

No. 4

The Authorship of St. John's Gospel

BY PROFESSOR HUGO ODEBERG

Professor Hugo Odeberg, D. D., Ph. D., who made the present article available to our journal, is professor of New Testament interpretation at the University of Lund, Sweden. He is widely known as the author of *The Fourth Gospel* (Uppsala och Stockholm, 1929), as chief consultant of *Erevna*, a Swedish theological journal interested in conservative Biblical studies, and as contributor to other theological journals. He is a recognized authority on Rabbinical literature. The present article was translated from Swedish into English by Miss J. Guinness and edited by P. M. B.

SOME New Testament books contain clear statements as to who wrote them. Oftentimes the author's name is mentioned at the beginning of the book. This is natural when it is an Epistle, for it is usual to specify in a letter both by whom it is written, and to whom it is sent. Most New Testament Epistles begin with the name of the sender and also mention the name or names of those to whom the Letter is addressed. The Epistle to the Galatians, for instance, opens with the author's name: "Paul, an Apostle . . . to the churches of Galatia." The writer not only gives his name, but also adds a personal attribute which proves his identity. The first Epistle of Peter, too, begins: "Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, to the elect who are sojourners in the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." The Epistle of Jude begins: "Judas, a servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are called." Other New Testament books, besides the Epistles, also contain in instances definite information regarding their authorship. Revelation, for example, states unmistakably and explicitly that its author is the John who was once banished to the Isle of Patmos. "I John, your brother and partaker with you in the tribulation and kingdom and patience which are in Jesus, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus" (Rev. 1:9).

But there are other New Testament writings, and among them some written in the form of Epistles, which do not reveal their authorship. The Epistle to the Hebrews opens without mentioning either the name of the writer or of those to whom it is sent. The same applies to the First Epistle of John. Of the four Gospels, Matthew and Mark are entirely anonymous. Also the Gospel of Luke does not state the author's name. Yet in its opening sentences the writer speaks in the first person singular, addressing the one to whom his Gospel is dedicated, thus taking it for granted that the writer was personally known to the addressee.

There are, however, other writings which, though they are neither entirely anonymous nor identify the writer by name, yet indicate so clearly who he is that it is impossible to call his identity in question. Among these are the Second and Third Epistles of John and the book which we are about to approach, the Gospel of John. The author of the Second and Third Epistles of John was known to contemporary readers, since the sender is named as ὁ πρεσβύτερος, i. e., "the elder," or "the aged." According to the earliest sources of information, this was a way of naming John, the son of Zebedee. Examining now the Gospel of John, we discover in the last chapter that the writer is "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (21:20, 24).

This disciple, who in the text of the Gospel is stated to be its author, never speaks of himself in the first person singular. He rather reserves the pronoun "I" for the principal person in the Gospel, Jesus Christ. However, in the Epistles of John and in the Book of Revelation, which are written by the same author, he often speaks in the first person singular.

Nevertheless, the writer of the fourth Gospel does refer to himself in the first person plural. That is to say, he includes himself when mentioning others, and he is one of those of whom the Gospel tells in its use of the pronominal third person. The Gospel contributes several passages which help us to identify the disciple "whom Jesus loved."

We find, for instance, the first person plural in John 1:14: "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among *us*, and *we* beheld His glory. . . ." The writer here refers to himself expressly as one who had seen Jesus and His works, who had indeed not only

seen, but had "beheld," that is, who had not only grasped that which the outward senses might note, but had seen Him as He really is, in His glory, that is, in His divine majesty. *The author is therefore an eyewitness who has recognized and understood the mystery of the Person of Christ.* This points to a particular disciple, one who had been with the Lord from the beginning and who remained with Him as His disciple. One is reminded of the opening words of the First Epistle of John: "That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled, concerning the Word of life . . . declare we."

But the writer is mentioned as an eyewitness also in the third person, and this witness is formally declared to be the writer of the Gospel in chapter 19:35: "And he that hath *seen* hath borne *witness*, and his witness is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye also may believe." Our first impression of this statement is that the writer wishes to say that he *knows* that he is speaking the truth, not merely that he knows that he is not lying. Yet he suggests more. *He means that he has seen that of which he testifies so completely that he really knows the truth about it.* Thus one who claims to know that he is speaking truly of Jesus Christ alleges himself to be among those who have been initiated into the deeper mysteries regarding the Person and work of Christ.

In the Gospel story this confidant and eyewitness is expressly called "the disciple whom Jesus loved" for the first time in the chapter which tells of Jesus' last supper with His disciples. It is there said of him: "There was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of His disciples, whom Jesus loved" (John 13:23). He had the place nearest to Jesus. Among the chosen disciples who were with their Lord on specially solemn occasions such as this, His last supper with His nearest followers, this disciple is given precedence over the others. His rank has been immortalized by the Fathers of the Church by the epithet they applied to him, ἐπιστήθιος, which corresponds to the expression "bosom friend."

The next mention of this disciple refers to him as standing at the foot of the Cross (John 19:26-27). He is the disciple to whom Jesus committed the care of His own mother, Mary, just before He gave up His spirit.

Again, it was "the disciple whom Jesus loved" and the foremost of the Apostles, Simon Peter, whom Mary Magdalene first told of her discovery that Jesus' grave was empty (John 20:2). Peter and this disciple went together to the grave, and although this disciple reached it first, he waited for Peter to enter before him and then followed him. These references indicate that this disciple was among the chief of the Apostles both during the earthly life of Jesus Christ and afterwards and that only Peter took precedence over him, a prerogative which the beloved disciple spontaneously accorded him.

Now, we know from the Gospel tradition, as we also know from the other three Gospels, that the three most prominent disciples of Jesus were Peter, James, and John. A disciple who was given the special privileges which the beloved disciple of John's Gospel was given must have been one of these three: Peter, James, or John. Now he cannot have been Peter, for Peter, as we have seen, is named in the passage referred to (John 20:2) as well as the beloved disciple. The choice remains, then, between James and John, both sons of Zebedee. Of these James must be excluded as being the author of John's Gospel, since, according to the testimony of the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 12:2), he was murdered by the order of Herod at an early stage in his Apostolic ministry, probably in the year 44 A.D. Now, we know that this Gospel cannot have been written as early as 44 A.D. Therefore only one disciple remains whose rank among his brethren corresponds to the one attributed to the writer of the Gospel, the Apostle John, the son of Zebedee. The Gospel itself, therefore, points to John, the son of Zebedee, as its author.

Having recognized this, one finds other, less prominent details in the Gospel which, in their turn, confirm the assumption that it is the Apostle John who is affirmed to be its author. Such passages as those which in a curious manner omit the mention of John's name, under circumstances which would normally have called for its use, are among these. We find an illustrative example in the record of the calling of the first disciples (John 1:35-51). We are told that first two of John the Baptist's disciples followed Jesus, but with regard to their names it is only stated that "*One of the two* which heard John speak and followed him was Andrew, Simon

Peter's brother" (John 1:40). The name of the other is not given. After this incident, each of the disciples is named: Simon Peter, Philip, Nathanael. There can be no question that the second of the first two disciples spoken of in John 1:40 is John, the son of Zebedee, the author of the Gospel. Thus it is tacitly indicated that the eyewitness, who is the writer of the Gospel, was with the Lord from the very beginning of His ministry, just as it is expressly emphasized, as we have seen, that he was present in the hour of Jesus' death and at the occasion when the grave was seen to be empty. The close relationship between "the beloved disciple" and Peter is confirmed by the Book of Acts, which repeatedly mentions Peter and John in one breath. We read there how "Peter and John were going up to the Temple" (Acts 3:1), how a lame man saw Peter and John about to go into the Temple (3:3), and how he "held Peter and John" (3:11). Again we find that the people "saw the boldness of Peter and John" (4:13), that "Peter and John answered" the Council (4:19), and that the Apostles sent Peter and John to Samaria when they heard that "Samaria had received the Word of God" (8:14). We see, therefore, that the references to "the beloved disciple" in the Gospel of John tally exactly with the picture we are given in the other Gospels and in the Acts if we assume that "the beloved disciple" was John, the son of Zebedee. There can be no doubt that the Christians who lived at the time when the Gospel was first written well understood to whom the expression "the disciple whom Jesus loved" referred. It referred to John, the son of Zebedee.

WHAT THE EARLY CHURCH TAUGHT ABOUT THE AUTHOR

We are not dependent, however, only on the internal evidence and the suggestions of the Gospel itself regarding its author's identity; there are also important data outside the Gospel which must be examined. The most significant source of information outside the Gospel itself with reference to its origin is the knowledge preserved by the Church. This knowledge is called tradition.

The faithful preservation of tradition is not a characteristic only of the primitive Church. In the history of almost every people, in widely separated areas, and at all periods, we find that there has been the effort to preserve traditions, and the capacity to do so.

Every people having a treasury of knowledge which it values and venerates, strives to preserve that treasury by means of tradition. This is most emphatically true when the treasure is looked upon as sacred. The ability faithfully to preserve tradition has been, and still is, peculiarly prominent among oriental peoples, although, as we have said, it is probably not entirely absent from any nation. Among the Eastern nations which have most carefully preserved their traditions, the foremost are the Jews, the Hindus, and the Chinese. Of these the Jews come first.

The primitive Christian Church, which in its early stages consisted largely of Jewish converts, possessed this capacity both to secure and to preserve tradition. But what do we mean by a genuine tradition? The question is not so irrelevant as it at first appears to be, for the word is sometimes used to connote things which cannot be called genuine tradition.

If a tradition is to be accepted as genuine, it must, first of all, be something handed down and carried forward with unchanged content and, essentially, in an unchanged form from one person to another, from one generation to another, and from one group to another. It must be a series, a chain, in which each link is fastened to the next. This is the first condition.

The second condition of a genuine tradition is that the first link in this chain of tradition must reach back to the place and time from which the content of the tradition derives, so that its foundation rests on facts. A tradition about an event must, in order to be genuine, have as its first link its "tradent," as it is called, that is, one or more persons who themselves witnessed the event. A tradition which contains someone's saying or doctrine must have as its first tradent a person or group of people who actually heard the utterance and carefully remembered its substance and even its form.

Hence we see that if a tradition is to be accounted genuine, it must derive from the original source and have been handed down in an unbroken chain, unchanged in any case, as to its content.

That it is important to keep these simple, obvious, and elementary principles in mind may easily be demonstrated from a few examples which lie well within the compass of the task we have set ourselves: the effort to determine the authorship of the fourth Gospel.

The narratives in the fourth Gospel, for instance, have sometimes been spoken of as being traditional. They are indeed narratives of what Jesus did and said or of what happened to Him. If these narratives are to be regarded traditional, or if we are to speak of tradition in them or behind them, we must assume two things: first, that what is told here really comes to us from an eyewitness and one who himself heard what is told; and, secondly, that the one who recorded it, that is to say, the author or compiler of the Gospel, is *not* himself that eyewitness, but one who has received the narrative indirectly or directly from an eyewitness. If we believe that the one who tells any event of the Gospel of John was himself an eyewitness, then his story is not a tradition. Nor is it a tradition if the Evangelist himself had adapted a typical Gospel story or has expounded a theological doctrine in order to meet the problems and needs of a later generation.

Another significant example may be given of beliefs held regarding the time and place of composition of the fourth Gospel. It is evident that one may speak not only of the traditions of the Gospel, that is, traditional records of the words and works of Jesus which are found in the Gospel text itself, but also, for instance, of traditions *about* the Gospel, traditions regarding its authorship, its date, the place where it was written, etc. Properly speaking, however, the word *tradition* in this connection can only be applied to such statements touching these questions which go back to the actual time and place of the writing of the Gospel and which have been preserved as a direct testimony regarding them. If some outstanding author, one of the fourth-century Fathers, for instance, on the ground of his researches, his study of the Bible, and of comparisons between the historical knowledge he had acquired and the statements of the Gospel itself, *draws* conclusions with regard to the authorship and date of the Gospel, and if afterwards these conclusions are repeated by later writers who quote him, this can never constitute a genuine tradition. Regardless of the number of years this Father's conclusions may be repeated and handed on, they can never become a tradition in the real and correct sense of the word, since they do not go back to the time of the origin of the Gospel. They remain the private conclusions of one of the Church Fathers. Now one often meets the claim in exegetical literature

that a statement referring to the origin of the Gospels is a tradition which may be found in the works of such and such a one of the Fathers. In such cases the word tradition is used in a misleading way. It is, therefore, of great importance to distinguish between a genuine tradition and the private opinions or conclusions of a Church Father or, indeed, of any learned man or of any individual group.

A genuine tradition must be conceded the utmost significance. When there is a chain of tradition, there is a strong guarantee for the truth and validity of its content. It is also a rule, practically without exception, that wherever there is an unbroken chain of tradition, the content of the tradition is preserved from generation to generation with the minutest accuracy. This fact has been definitely proved by experience in a variety of ways. Over and over again historical and archaeological discoveries have proved the accuracy of a tradition which had been subject to doubt owing to its apparent incredibility or to other arguments and conclusions. It has been proved that it is possible to preserve the content and even the form of a tradition unchanged through thousands of years. That which has been handed down by word of mouth has often shown itself to be better protected from corruption than that which has been committed to writing and print. Copies and reprints always leave room for clerical and printers' errors, that is, for mistakes and changes.

We must call attention to another very simple and somewhat obvious thing because it is frequently overlooked. A tradition may consist of the content only, or of both content and form. Or, to use a technical term, there are traditions with a fixed content only, and traditions with both a fixed content and a fixed form. The latter are much more common than the former. Traditions which are only fixed as to content, not as to form, usually consist of only a few facts. A tradition which is made up of a large number of related facts is usually wholly or relatively fixed as to its form and, if it was not fixed from the first, became so in course of time.

With regard to the authorship of the Gospel of John, its date, and the place where it was written, there is an unbroken tradition which admits of only one construction. But this tradition is fixed in its content, not in its form. This, however, is, as we have just

proved, quite natural. The tradition, although it is clear and cannot admit of more than one interpretation, contains only three plain, simple facts: (1) The author of the Gospel is John, the son of Zebedee; (2) the Gospel was written in Asia Minor; (3) the Gospel was published by John while he was living at Ephesus and had reached an advanced age.

The tradition is chiefly found in the writings of the early Fathers. The most important reference to it is to be found in Irenaeus (142—202 A.D.), who was Bishop of Lyons about 178 A.D. Irenaeus' statement about these facts is in a clear and well-connected chain of tradition: The Apostle John—Bishop Polycarp of Smyrna—Bishop Irenaeus of Lyons. Bishop Polycarp of Smyrna was the personal disciple of the Apostle John, and Irenaeus the personal disciple of Polycarp, and in each case their period of discipleship was in their youth. According to the quotation in Eusebius' *History* (5:8:4), Irenaeus says: "John the disciple of the Lord, who leaned on the Lord's bosom, published the Gospel himself while he was living at Ephesus in the province of Asia." Whenever Irenaeus says, "The Lord's disciple," he names John the son of Zebedee.

In a fragment of a list of the writings which were regarded sacred in the churches at the end of the first century, a fragment which has been named after its discoverer and is called Muratori's Fragment, Luke is named as the third Gospel and John as the fourth. The section of the list which mentioned the first and second Gospels is missing. The compiler of this list, who was probably Bishop Hippolytus (about 165—234 A.D.), says about John's Gospel:

"As the fourth Gospel (we have) that by John, one of the disciples. Because his disciples and bishops (continually) urged him (to make his Gospel public), he said to them: 'Fast with me for three days from today, and let us then tell one another what has been revealed to each one of us.' It was then revealed to Andrew, one of the Apostles, that John should tell all in his name and the others should examine his work. It makes no difference therefore to the faith of believers that the Gospels begin in different ways, because everything regarding (the Lord's) birth, suffering, resurrection, converse with His disciples, or His two advents—

the first in lowliness (and) despised, which has already come to pass, (and) the second in royal power and glory, which is yet to be — because all this in each of them is set forth by the same guiding Spirit. Little wonder, then, that John so definitely states all this in his Epistles, and says of himself: 'That which our eyes have seen and our ears have heard and which our hands have handled write we unto you.' In this way he declares himself not only to be an eyewitness, but also one who has heard and recorded all the Lord's (Christ's) miracles."

There is no reason to doubt that the first part of this statement is something which the writer of the document quotes as having been communicated to him. It is not, however, expressly stated that it is in every detail a tradition, that is, a communication that goes back to the original source. The place of publication of the Gospel, which is taken for granted, and presumably regarded as so obvious that it did not require specific mention, is Asia Minor; for it was there the Apostle John had his bishops. While John was in Ephesus, he was quite naturally a spiritual father and authority for the bishops of the neighboring cities, a circumstance which is also inferred, as we shall show later, in the Book of Revelation, since we read there the letters which John sent to the seven churches of Asia Minor.

Clement of Alexandria in Egypt († A. D. 215) makes the following statement, telling us expressly that it is a tradition: "In consideration of the fact that what had been revealed in the (other) Gospels was (so to speak) the bodily form (of the Gospel), John, as the last (of the Gospel authors) wrote a spiritual Gospel, being urged thereto by men of repute and divinely led by the Spirit." Clement of Alexandria tells, moreover, in another connection, that John appointed bishops when he returned to Ephesus after his banishment to the Isle of Patmos. We observe that Clement here makes the same statement as the Muratori Fragment, namely, that the Gospel was published at the urgent request of others.

This statement by Clement contains two expressions which demand a fuller explanation, "The bodily form of the Gospel" and "a spiritual Gospel." The word "bodily" here means simply the rudiments, the first things which were taught to those who had not yet become Christians, and which were to them the basic el-

ements of their Christian faith. The "spiritual," on the other hand, was what Paul in his First Epistle to the Corinthians also calls "spiritual," or "wisdom," and of which he says, "We speak wisdom among the perfect" (1 Cor. 2:6). The fundamental facts themselves around which the explanation was built in the elementary teaching, that is, in the "bodily form," were the same as in the more advanced teaching, the "spiritual" Gospel. The central themes were in both cases Christ's work of salvation, His death and resurrection. The difference consisted in the deeper penetration into these facts of salvation, or foundation facts, which was imparted in the "spiritual" Gospel. This difference was caused by the fact that the readers or listeners had arrived at different levels of maturity. It is natural to present a body of doctrine to listeners or readers who are mature, experienced, and spiritually advanced in a way different from that which we employ when instructing those who as yet have no spiritual experience or only a very elementary one. This is true in all areas of learning.

The first three Gospels correspond manifestly to what has been called missionary teaching, that is to say, elementary teaching. But the Gospel of John, according to tradition, represents a deeper understanding of revealed truth. Yet the subject matter is in each case the same: Christ's work of salvation. It is not, therefore, entirely correct to represent John's Gospel as being, in relation to the first three, a spiritual Gospel and the others as only bodily Gospels if this implies that the first three treat of the externals of the work and teaching of Christ and John's more of the inner side. The first three are not called "bodily" Gospels to suggest that they do not deal with the central truths of the work of Christ or that they only regard His work from the outward point of view. The rudimentary teaching truly had as its content the most central theme of the Gospel: Jesus Christ and Him Crucified, as Paul puts it in First Corinthians (2:2). On the other hand, it is true that a "spiritual," "pneumatic" Gospel penetrates more deeply into this central theme and points out the deeper significance of all that Jesus did and said.

The rest of the early Fathers who speak of the origin of the Gospel of John repeat the details concerning authorship, date, and place of writing which have been mentioned in the statements

already quoted, in so far as they make reference to tradition. There is, as we have observed and emphasized already, a great difference between referring to tradition and making a statement on the ground of one's own conclusions. The isolated statements which may be found in the writings of the Syrian Father Ephraim (Efrem) must be counted among the latter. He says at the end of his commentary on the Gospel harmony, the *Diatessaron*: "John wrote it (the Gospel) in Greek at Antioch, for he stayed in that country until the time of the Emperor Trajan (98 A.D.)." This is not recorded from a tradition. It is comparatively easy to reconstruct the deduction which led Ephraim to this conclusion. He knew that Bishop Ignatius of Antioch was a disciple of the Apostle John, and draws the conclusion from this fact that John must have had his settled ministry in Antioch. To the Syrian Father, it was natural to regard the Capital of Syria, Antioch, as a central see from which John's sojournings in Asia Minor might be looked upon as temporary excursions. Antioch lay approximately halfway between the two places where John would appear chiefly to have lived, Jerusalem (in his early period) and Ephesus (during the later period of his life).

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE GOSPEL

The term *authenticity* denotes the fact that a given book really was written by the one who is said to be its author either in the writing itself or in a tradition regarding it. The question whether the Gospel of John may be regarded as authentic, is, then, a question whether the Apostle John, the son of Zebedee, was or was not its author. That he was the author the Gospel itself implies, as we have seen, and tradition expressly states.

If we call in question the authenticity of John's Gospel, a few fundamental things must be pointed out.

First, we must recall that the early Christian Church tested most thoroughly the authenticity of all writings which laid claim to be of Apostolic origin. It must not be imagined that credulity carried any weight in this matter. One of the first conditions a book had to meet to be regarded as a genuine Christian Scripture was that it was in general use in the churches, and that it was used for public reading in the services. The early Christian Church was, indeed,

so careful in this respect that some writings which were certainly of Apostolic origin were not regarded as genuine Christian Scripture. We know, for example, that the Apostle Paul wrote at least one Letter to the church in Corinth which was not included among the authentic Scriptures, simply because it was not generally used throughout the whole Church. And we have every reason to suppose that other Letters by Paul were not included. The Church knew that she was under the guidance of the living Lord, Christ, and the Scriptures which had been generally accepted in all the churches had, because of this very circumstance, the sanction, so to speak, of the Lord Himself. And the usage of certain Christian Scriptures in the Church evidently went back to the source itself, so that the fact of usage became a significant point in the tradition.

Secondly, the fact that there is a tradition with regard to the origin and authorship of any writing is a very important point. Tradition must, as we have already shown, be regarded as a strong credential, and we must have peculiarly emphatic reasons for rejecting it. Anyone who calls the traditional point of view in question must give proof of his position. Any reasons which disregard the statements of a tradition must be supported by documentary evidence, that is to say, there must be valid proofs taken from writings or from historical discoveries to which unquestionable dates can be affixed. If there were, for example, a writing dating from the beginning of the second century, the genuineness of which was beyond question, and which showed that the Gospel of John had another author, or which proved that the Gospel was not written until the second century, a certain doubt might arise regarding the authenticity of this Gospel. But there are *no documents whatever* and *no historical discoveries* which in any way contradict the tradition that the Gospel of John was published by the Apostle John during the latter part of his ministry, while he was residing at Ephesus.

No objections to established authenticity may be seriously entertained if these objections result only from personal and private conjectures as to what is reasonable or possible. Experience has proved such conjectures so utterly worthless that their day should by now be past among those who claim to be seriously interested

in scholarship. Data which were said to be impossible or improbable on the ground of personal views or conclusions — that is, without documentary evidence — have often proved to be the only possibility or probability when further knowledge came to light through discovery or research. Among many examples of this nature we quote one: From the earliest times St. Paul's Epistle to Philemon was believed to have been written from Rome to Philemon in Colossae in Asia Minor. The Epistle tells of a runaway slave, Onesimus, who was at the same place where Paul was. It was argued that it was impossible, or highly improbable, that a slave who ran away from his master in Asia Minor should have gone as far as Rome and, further, that he should have gone to the capital, where he would run a greater risk than anywhere else of being apprehended by the Roman instrument of justice, which was concentrated in Rome. This is a typical argument based upon what is taken for granted, that is, upon what is thought to be reasonable. But what is here thought "reasonable" is grounded, as it is so often in other connections, upon ignorance. In reality it has been found by those who have taken the trouble to inform themselves of the facts of the case that runaway slaves of that period chose to flee to Rome, where they had the surest prospect of being able to evade their masters' search and so escape being caught and sent back.

Another example of reasoning which is founded on ignorance, and which touches the Gospel of John directly, is the following: It is said that the Apostle John was a fisherman from Galilee. How could an ignorant, uncouth fisherman from obscure Galilee — so runs the objection — have written such beautiful Greek language and conceived so artistic a work as the Gospel of John? This argument can be defended only as long as one is entirely ignorant of the conditions of the time and circumstances here in question. Even a very little general reading and historical knowledge make this objection ridiculous. Even if the particular qualifications which came into being through the writer's apprehension by Christ are entirely ignored, one need only point, for example, to the number of remarkably learned rabbis in those days who were recruited from the artisan class. If one is acquainted, for instance, with the well-known story of Rabbi Ahiba, who until his fortieth

year was an entirely unlearned tiller of the soil and in a far lower social position than the Apostle John, but who at that age began to study and became a most learned and influential rabbinical scholar, then such an objection as the one mentioned above can only provoke a smile of compassion. We have, moreover, many examples from modern times which illustrate how a gripping experience can educate a man and give him knowledge and capacity far beyond that which may be acquired through regular schooling and academic training. But such objections often appear to be more enlightening than the reasons that rest on real facts. This is quite natural in cases when the reader is as ignorant of the matter as the person who propounds his objection. It is reasonable and probable to him who puts forward his opinion; and it is just as reasonable and probable to him who reads what the first has written. When the informed person tells the ignorant person the real facts of the case, he carries him beyond the sphere of experience, and doubt easily arises in the latter's mind, and he says: This is impossible and incredible. In brief, the argument built on the premise that John because he was a fisherman was therefore ignorant is an example of reasoning which grows out of lack of knowledge. It is not an objection which is worthy of being met in serious debate.

Doubts regarding, or denial of, the authenticity of the Gospel of John have found expression in only two limited periods in the eighteen hundred years in which the Gospel has been in existence. The first of these two periods was very brief. It occurred at the close of the second century and in a limited circle. A small group in Asia Minor denied the genuineness of the fourth Gospel and won over a certain Gaius of Rome to its point of view. The group is named by one of the Church Fathers, Epiphanius, in a list of heresies and false doctrines which he compiled and described. The group referred to is the fifty-first of the heresies which he enumerates, and Epiphanius gave them, intentionally, a name with a double meaning: *Alogi*. By applying to them this name, which means literally those who are without *Logos*, Epiphanius meant to emphasize the point that they deny the Gospel which speaks of the Word, the *Logos*, which was in the beginning with God and was God, that is, the Gospel of John. But *Alogi* also means "without reason," or "foolish" (cf. *illogical*).

It was not because of historical research that these people had reached the conclusion that John was not the writer of the fourth Gospel, much less because they had a tradition to support their views. Their rejection of the Gospel was the result of a theological interest. They were the bitter opponents of a sectarian movement, called Montanism, which had spread widely at that time and which used the Gospel of John to support the belief held by its members that the Spirit which Jesus had promised, the Paraclete, was actively at work among them. In order to deprive the Montanists of the support of the Gospel of John, the so-called *Alogi* maintained that it was not John, but Cerinthus, whom John opposed, who was the author of the Gospel.

The second time the authenticity of the Gospel was seriously questioned was at a much later date. This second period began at the close of the eighteenth century and has lasted to our own day. For all practical purposes it has ended in 1935, as we shall show immediately. But because there still are many New Testament scholars who have been accustomed since their student days to regard the fourth Gospel as non-Johannine and non-Apostolic, we still find in textbooks and even in scientific theological works the outworn doubts regarding the authenticity of this Gospel.

It was Evanson, an Englishman, who in 1792 stated his doubts concerning the Apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel. In that year Evanson published a work entitled *The Dissonance of the Four Generally Received Evangelists*. He supported his argument, as the title of the book implies, by recourse to the alleged contradictions and differences between the first three Gospels and the fourth. He maintained that an Apostle and eyewitness could not have written the Gospel, but that it must have been some philosopher of the Platonic school of the second century. Evanson was followed by other English and German theologians. The work which may be regarded as the real beginning of the attack on the fourth Gospel, which reached its climax in the nineteenth century, was the German Superintendent Bretschneider's thesis in Latin: *Probabilia de evangelii et epistolarum Johannis apostoli indole et origine* (Probabilities concerning the characteristics and origin of the Gospel and the Epistles of the Apostle John), which he, as the title says, "modestly submits to the judgment of the learned"

(*eruditorum iudiciis modeste*). He asserted, moreover, that the Gospel was not written by John, but by a converted Gentile, who probably came from Alexandria in Egypt and lived in the first half of the second century. He took his Alexandrian origin for granted because he thought that the author of the Gospel must have been schooled in Alexandrian philosophy. Bretschneider indeed confessed in later years that his position was untenable. His book became typical, however, of a negative attitude toward the Gospel, because his principal objection was directed against the Christology of John's Gospel, which, he maintained, proved the Gospel to be a post-Apostolic writing.

The zenith of attack on the authenticity of the Gospel of John was reached by the theories which were put forward by that giant in so-called critical exegesis, Ferdinand Christian Baur, professor at Tuebingen and leader of the theological persuasion known as the Tuebingen School. Baur published his first critical remarks in 1844 in Zeller's *Theological Yearbook* and later, in 1847, in *Critical Studies in the Canonical Gospels*.

Although Baur's whole theory has been proved false, he is the past master among all modern critics in the ability of logical and cogent demonstration. The reason that his presentation is false is that he built his whole fabric on a shaky basis. His foundation was his reconstruction of early Christianity. Baur accepted the dialectic philosophy of the German philosopher Hegel and reconstructed church history in accordance with Hegel's dialectic: thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. He believed this dialectic to be the ruling principle in historical development.

In Christianity and the growth of the Christian Church the thesis, according to Baur, is a Jewish-Christian point of view; the antithesis is the reaction against everything Jewish, the direct opposition of Christianity to Judaism. This antithesis, so Baur believed, was initiated and supported by the ministry and theology of the Apostle Paul. The synthesis came later in the settling of the strife which had arisen. In Baur's historical reconstruction there is no room for the Gospel of John before the latter half of the second century, and consequently he places the origin of the Gospel about A.D. 170. The Gospel which is presented as an account of the life and work of Christ is therefore for Baur, in

reality, a paraphrase and reinterpretation of the teaching of Christ and a doctrine about Him adapted to the needs of a later time. It does not reflect the period which was contemporary with Jesus, but its own period with its opinions and problems.

It may, with good reason, be said that all subsequent criticisms of the fourth Gospel are in reality only modifications of Baur's theories, modifications which have most often been caused by the unreasonableness of placing the origin of the Gospel too far forward in time. In general, however, critics have held to Baur's fundamental theory, that the Gospel does not reflect the real circumstances and events of the period which it professes to portray, but the theology and the demands of a later time.

Naturally enough, throughout the whole period in which the Gospel has been so freely criticized there have always been some students who defended the genuine character of John's Gospel and who therefore looked for historical proofs and other arguments which would refute the critics and justify the traditional position. These efforts had a positive value: the necessity of refuting the critical position brought to light new and valuable material. But these efforts also had a negative aspect: conservative theologians often became the victims of those whom they were seeking to refute, and so it happened that the critical approach dominated also the work of those who were opposed to negative criticism.

Finally, efforts at reconciliation were made. Some tried to find good points on both sides and to discover theories which would in a measure justify both interpretations. In this category we must place the suggestion which claimed that the "core" of the Gospel is historical, although it obviously reflects the theology of a later period. Here we must mention also the whimsical notion that the Gospel was not written by the Apostle John, but by one who was named John and who stood in some relation to the Apostle, a so-called "Presbyter" John of Ephesus. In the same category are the attempts to divide the Gospel into various "sources," the so-called "divided-source" hypothesis, according to which the Gospel as we now have it came into existence in different stages: an ancient, possibly historical record, a later theological revision, and a final carefully edited composition.

Both the negative criticism and the attempts at reconciliation

were, however, dependent on one essential presupposition: that the Gospel did not come into existence before the end of the second century. Behind this lay the theological concern to be able to support a theory of historical development in which there was no place for a Gospel which had an Apostle and an intimate eyewitness as its author. All these attempts are futile if it can be proved that the Gospel must have been written in the first century when some of the first eyewitnesses were still alive. For it was clear, even to the logical critics, perhaps especially to them, that a Gospel claiming to be the testimony of an eyewitness who was so personally acquainted with Jesus and His work as the disciple whom Jesus loved, could not have come into being during that disciple's lifetime and not be written by him.

That negative criticism could command such wide attention as it did was due to the fact that it was not the fruit of pure research, but resulted from a concern which was interwoven with the widely accepted opinions of contemporary thinkers. It seemed unreasonable and undesirable that one of Jesus Christ's Apostles should have expressed such lofty thoughts as those found in the Gospel of John. The statement that the Gospel was not by John, but came from another period was no more than wishful thinking. Typical examples of such thinking are easy to find. Weizsaecker, for instance, says in his book on the Apostolic Era (*Apostolisches Zeitalter*): "It is in no wise thinkable that any of the Apostles could unite his belief in Christ with the belief that Christ was that Word which was in the beginning with God and was God." In his *Handcommentar*, Holtzmann maintains that it is impossible to believe that Christ, as He does in the Gospel of John, would speak of His divine and His human nature. Other critics bluntly declared that Jesus could not possibly have been pre-existent as God. No one who had actually seen and heard Jesus and even been His intimate friend could possibly, so they reasoned, have arrived at the conclusion that the Jesus whom he had seen with his own eyes was the Christ, the Son of God. The Gospel of John, therefore, must have been written by some other than an eyewitness and an Apostle, and, besides, it must have originated, at the earliest, in the second century when every firsthand recollection of Jesus had died out.

The fact that such reasoning was considered enlightening and clear did not depend on its intrinsic value, but rather upon its correspondence with views of life then prevalent. It is obvious that, given other premises, it is possible to argue in the opposite direction, and to do so with greater cogency. It is possible to say: It is unbelievable that anyone could conceive the idea of attributing to a man whom he had never seen, but only heard of, divine attributes or so unique a position as the one Jesus holds in the Gospels. The conception of Jesus which we find in the Gospels cannot reasonably be explained in any other way than that it is derived from men who had lived under the immediate influence of an overwhelming personality. What is said of Jesus in the Gospel of John is inexplicable if we are to regard it as an imaginative creation. We can account for it only on the assumption that it comes from one who, as the declared author claims to do, speaks of that which he himself has heard, which his own eyes have seen and beheld, and which he has handled with his hands. Only one who was present himself and who therefore cannot doubt the testimony of his own eyes and ears, and of years of personal experience, can tell such unique things about another as the Gospel of John does about Jesus. Such an argument is on rational grounds at least as valid as its opposite.

PAPYRUS DISCOVERIES WHICH THROW LIGHT ON THE DATE OF THE GOSPEL

Students who recognized the groundless nature of the criticism against the Gospel of John naturally endeavored to check and refute each point of the arguments that had been brought forward against the genuineness of the Gospel. It will be readily understood that the critics did not content themselves with propounding their chief argument, the decisive reason for rejecting the genuineness of the Gospel, but they looked for proofs independent of the bias which lay behind the main argument. Secondary arguments of this kind were, for instance, that John's Gospel differs from the other three Gospels in its record of the life and words of Jesus and that John's Gospel is colored by Hellenism and is not Palestinian. These secondary arguments, however, were so loosely conceived that they were exceedingly easy to refute by means of

study and research into the contemporary literature and history of the early Christian period. They all proved to be without evidence if it was not first assumed that the Gospel was not written until late in the second century. Yet this was the fact which needed to be demonstrated, for the entire argument which denies the Apostolic origin of the Gospel hung upon it.

This was true, for instance, with regard to the statement that the Gospel was thoroughly permeated by Hellenistic thought and must therefore have been written in a period when the Christian Church was under Hellenistic influences. It was possible to maintain the probability of such a statement only as long as the student limited his search for parallel examples and proofs to Greek literature which threw light upon conditions prevailing in the second century.

If the student took the trouble to study the extensive Jewish literature, he soon found that far from being exclusively familiar with Hellenistic thought, the writer of the Gospel of John was at least equally familiar with Palestinian conditions and Jewish terminology. It is, in fact, possible to make discoveries in Jewish and Samaritan literature and in Oriental literature generally which throw light on John's Gospel and which are equally rewarding and to the point. This could be refuted by no other argument than that John's Gospel was, after all, a production of the second century, which no longer had any connection with the Palestinian tradition. It was clear, then, that the only real support for the denial of the genuineness of the Gospel was the statement that the Gospel originated in the second century. If it could be demonstrated that the date of the origin of John's Gospel could not be placed so late as A. D. 120 or thereafter, the whole fabric of criticism was completely shattered.

A definite proof of this nature came to light in 1935 with the discovery of a fragment of a transcription of the Gospel of John found among the papyri in the John Ryland's Library in Manchester. It had been brought there from Egypt.

Little by little an almost numberless quantity of different kinds of papyrus dating from different centuries has been discovered in the sands of Egypt. The study of these papyri has become a science of its own, and the students of this science have succeeded

in finding exact methods by means of which they can determine the date and nature of each papyrus. Since there is such a vast quantity of material to compare and classify, it has become possible to determine the date of a papyrus by its appearance (the texture and the construction of the papyrus sheet), the shape of the writing, the letters, abbreviations, etc. Theoretically, therefore, it is possible to determine the date of a papyrus to within a decade by its external character, without any reference to its content.

The contents of these papyri vary. There are business letters, letters from moneylenders requesting payment, tailors' bills, and transcriptions of books and pamphlets which belonged to some private library or to the archives of a society. We also find among these papyri fragments of the writings of Greek philosophers and historians and of religious writings and classical poems. It is not surprising that among these papyri, fragments of copies of Christian writings have been found, and among them fragments of copies of Old Testament and New Testament books. These transcriptions date from different centuries, of course, as the papyri in general do.

The oldest fragment of a copy of a New Testament Scripture which has so far been discovered is the fragment of the Gospel of John found in 1935. This fragment was in a group of papyrus which had been classified under the nineties of the first century A.D., and could not be placed later than the very beginning of the second century. But let us remember that this papyrus is only a *copy*. This proves that the Gospel of John was known and that copies of it had been spread as far as Egypt by about A.D. 100. Clearly then, the original, the Gospel of John itself, must have been in existence before any copies of it could be made. All theories about the Gospel which rest on the assumption that the Gospel originally dates from some decade in the second century, long after the death of the Apostle John, have therefore become entirely unhistorical.

Quite obviously, then, the basis for a historical view of the Gospel are the statements of the Gospel itself and the testimony of tradition with regard to its authorship and the date of its origin. This point of departure claims that the author was an eyewitness; and among all the eyewitnesses he was an Apostle; and among the

Apostles he was the Apostle John, the son of Zebedee. Working from this basis, moreover, we find the least difficulty in understanding how the Gospel could come into existence and possess its own peculiar character.

THE THEORY OF THE "PRESBYTER" JOHN

This theory belongs into the same category as the above-named theories which all take for granted that the Gospel of John came into existence after the death of the Apostle John, during the second century. The justification of the theory, moreover, stands and falls with the supposition that the Gospel was written toward the middle or close of the second century, for only if the Gospel came into existence after the death of the Apostle John, is there any cause to look for another John who might have been its author. The theory of a "Presbyter" John as author is related to the effort to explain and defend the fact that the Gospel had been issued in John's name, especially in the name of a John of Ephesus.

This theory is so vaguely grounded that it is mentioned only as a classic example of the unsatisfactory or, in reality, non-existent foundations which have been used to support a theory by those who had to defend a theological concern.

First of all, we must point out that nowhere in literature do we find any reference to a "Presbyter" John who was said to have written the Gospel until this theory was brought forward in the last century. None of the Fathers or other writers in the whole history of the Church have mentioned or even hinted at such a thing.

Dionysius of Alexandria put forward his guess, about A. D. 250, that the Book of Revelation was written by another John than the Apostle John. Dionysius noted that Revelation was written in a style different from the Gospel of John, and having been trained in philosophical thought and expressions, he had little understanding of the symbolism of Revelation. It was therefore his theological concern to attribute that book to another author. Since he was altogether persuaded that the Gospel of John had been written by the Apostle John, he supposed that Revelation must have been written by another John. But he says explicitly that this is only a guess. He quotes no sources which say that Revelation was by another John, nor did he have any authority for this state-

ment that there had lived another John of such prominence that his authority was sufficient to authenticate a canonical Scripture. His conclusion that there was another John was a guess which he founded on the fact that at Ephesus there were two memorials bearing the name John. Dionysius does not mention a "Presbyter" John.

Eusebius (A.D. 325), who also takes it for granted that the fourth Gospel was written by the Apostle John, quotes Dionysius of Alexandria and also suggests that Revelation might have been written by another John. The ground of his guess is a quotation from Bishop Papias of Hierapolis, who, according to Eusebius' supposition, had known both the Apostle John and another John. The title "Presbyter" John derives, falsely, from this quotation. We see therefore that Eusebius had no reliable authority on which to ground his supposition. He builds on his own conclusions.

Now, we must observe that Papias in the passage which Eusebius quotes, and which we have only in his quotation, cannot with any certainty be said to mention two distinct Johns. Furthermore, it should be noted that the quotation does not refer to any John at all called "Presbyter" to be distinguished from other prominent men. In this quotation, which is the *only* so-called ground for the theory that there was a "Presbyter" John, several individuals are mentioned under the title "Presbyter." This word is best rendered in the passage given as "the aged" or "the Elder." The quotation from Papias must be given here in translation in order to make this matter clear, and the word "Presbyter" will, wherever it occurs, be translated "Elder," since this is its meaning. For this quotation has often been strangely falsified by the defenders of the theory of another John, who employed the word "Presbyter" only in one place—the place where it suited the theory—and in every other place where the word occurs they translated it "aged" or "Elder" or used a similar term, so that the false impression is created that Papias speaks of a John who, in contradistinction to all others, even the Apostle John, was called "Presbyter." The quotation reads:

"I will not hesitate to cite and compare the things of which I was given sure knowledge by *the Elders* and which I ascertained . . . wherever (and whenever) I met anyone who had companied with *the Elders*, I sought after the words of *the Elders*, what Andrew and

what Peter had said, what Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew or what some *other* of the Lord's disciples had said, so also what Aristion or *the Elder John*, the Lord's disciples, say."

It should be noted that Papias does not say a word about John's Gospel or about any other Johannine Scripture. He is speaking of the tradition handed down by word of mouth from the Lord's disciples which he collected, tradition, that is to say, outside the written Gospels which were already in existence.

The remarkable differentiation between what certain of the disciples of Jesus *had said* and what two disciples *say* may most simply be explained if one interprets, without preconceived ideas, in this way: When Papias collected his information, a large number of the Lord's disciples were no longer alive, and he can find out only what they *had said*. But the Apostle John was still alive, and with regard to him he can note both what he *had said* and what he *was still saying*. And since most of the Lord's disciples had already died, he found it of value to note what another disciple of Jesus who was still living, Aristion, was saying. It would appear most natural therefore to conclude that the designation "the Elders" is applied to the Apostles. Those who are given the title "the Elders" are the Apostles, among them John. That the word "the Elder" is used a second time before John's name distinguishes him as an Apostle from Aristion, who was only a disciple.

This statement by Papias in no wise therefore suggests that he is speaking of two different Johns. Probability leans toward the conclusion that he knew of only one John, the Elder, or *the Presbyter, John*, that is to say, *the Apostle John*, just as he clearly speaks of the *Presbyter Andrew*, the *Presbyter Peter*, the *Presbyter Philip*, the *Presbyter Thomas*, and so forth, all of them *Apostles*.

If it is true, however, that Papias is speaking of two Johns, of whom one was not an Apostle, then he is only one of several people he calls Presbyters. Not a single word of Papias says or even remotely suggests that he had any connection with the authorship of John's Gospel.

There is, however, one more factor which makes it probable that Papias is using an expression which was common toward the close of the Apostolic Era and immediately after it, thus honoring the Apostles with the title "the Elders," or "Presbyters."

The Second and Third Epistles of John begin with a greeting simply from "the Elder," or "the Presbyter," without the addition of a name. Obviously this means that when these Letters were written, their recipients knew only of one who bore the honored title. This is only natural if we assume that it is the Apostle John, who, after the death of all the other Apostles, was the only one living of "*the Elders*" and would, therefore, immediately be recognized by the name "the Elder," or "the Presbyter."

It may also be remarked that it was natural for Papias and his generation to refer to the Apostles by the name "the Elders." Papias belonged to the generation which immediately followed the generation of the Apostles. Papias was a contemporary of Polycarp, and, according to Irenaeus, both had been disciples of the Apostle John. It is highly improbable, on the other hand, that Papias would call the disciples of the Apostles, the outstanding men of the generation after the Apostles, that is, of his own generation, "the Elders." To his generation it would be natural to call the prominent men of the generation before their own "the Elders." It is obvious that those whom a later generation called "the Elders" would not be given that title by the men of their own generation. It is therefore natural that Papias (70—145) called those who had followed the Lord, that is, His Apostles, "the Elders," and that, in a later generation, those who had heard the Lord's Apostles and who carried on their work, were called "the Elders," as they were, for instance, by Irenaeus (142—202). It is, then, most probable, in fact as good as certain, that Papias, when he uses the word "Elders" refers to the men whose names he mentions, that is, the Apostles Peter, Andrew, Philip, James, John, Matthew. And so it is perfectly clear that the title "the Elder," when applied to John, has the same significance which it has when it is applied to Peter or Andrew. Presbyter John, or the Elder John, is therefore the same as the Apostle John. Papias, then, does not mention or know of any special "Presbyter" John. But Papias' statement is the only ground for the hypothesis that there was a "Presbyter" John who was distinct from the Apostle John. This "Presbyter" John is a fiction of the imagination as chimeric and little connected with history as any character in a fairy tale.

Lund, Sweden

The Temptation of the Church

A Study of Matt. 4:1-11

By J. J. PELIKAN, JR.

THIS brief essay purposes to examine the temptation of Jesus in the wilderness, not so much the problems which this narrative poses for the area of dogmatics we call Christology (though these are considerable), but the way the story highlights some of the most profound temptations to which the Church and its ministers are subject. For in the three questions which the devil put to Jesus, as Dostoevsky observed, "the whole subsequent history of mankind is, as it were, brought together into one whole, and in them are united all the unresolved historical contradictions of human nature."

I

The first of the three temptations came in the devil's challenge: "If Thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread." To this challenge our Lord responded with the word from Deuteronomy: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God." Faced by a choice between the spectacular and the kerygmatic, Jesus chose the kerygmatic. Miracle worker that He was to be, He nevertheless insisted that the allure which the miraculous holds for men was not the purpose of His coming nor the central feature of His work. For man does not live by bread alone, not even by bread miraculously wrought, but by the speaking of God. This was not the last time in Jesus' career that He was confronted by this choice. Repeatedly He drew men by miracles whom He did not hold afterwards by His message, for men will always respond to the miraculous, but it is only the speaking of God that gives them life.

The temptation to succeed through the miraculous and the spectacular rather than through the kerygmatic is one which has come over and over again to the Church, as it came to Christ; and the history of Christianity is testimony to the fact that the Church has not always been as able to withstand the temptation as was its Lord. "Not by bread alone": an obvious application of this word

to the church suppers which have become so integral a part of our ecclesiastical life in America. When the Church is cumbered about much serving, it is in danger of supposing that though man cannot live by bread alone, he can live by bread and sauerkraut and Swiss steak and all the other delicacies featured at church dinners. But this is only an indirect and occasional example of the fundamental evil this temptation brings. The whole desire for the miraculous and the spectacular to which our ministry so often caters shows how deep-seated a temptation this is and how persistent is the Tempter in addressing it to the Church.

Man shall not live by bread alone, and the ministry does not live by management alone either. Contrary to the impression one sometimes receives, it is not enough in the ministry to be busy, and I dare say that the fires of hell are not quenched by tears which devils shed over busy pastors as long as they are just busy and forget to feed those committed to their charge with that by which alone men live. When a ministry ceases to be basically kerygmatic and prophetic in character and becomes instead a ministry of public relations and publicity, statistics and meetings, then someone has forgotten, or is at least in danger of forgetting, that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word proceeding from the mouth of God. And the marks, or, as they have been called, the "constitutive aspects," of the Church's life are still the means by which the speaking God addresses Himself creatively to men, the preached Gospel and the administered Sacraments.

The first temptation of Jesus offers us all an excellent opportunity to look once more at ourselves, at our own ministries, and at our church life. One of the great threats to church life in American Protestantism, it seems to me, is its preoccupation with externals, its endless church societies, and the gradual atomization of its parish life through the substitution of bread and circuses for the living proclamation of the living Word. The revival movement, which has characterized American Protestantism for two centuries, is in many ways an admission of its failure on just this score and an attempt to substitute something spectacular for its utterly unspectacular failure to hold men by other means. Call it activism or social consciousness or busy church life, anything which leads men to believe that they do not live by the Word, and that the

Church does not live by the Word, represents the Church's "Yes" to the temptation to which our Lord said such a decided "No." The devil is not sad over the fact that someone enters the ministry, as he would not have been sad over the Lord's demonstration by a miracle that He was the Son of God. But he is sad when, as is the Church's ancient custom, men make the sign of the Cross to drive him away; for the Cross, which was the supreme word proceeding from the mouth of God, gives men a life over which the Prince of death has no control.

"By every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God" — here is the secret of life. As our first parents began their fall by the question "Hath God truly said?" so the Second Adam begins His repair of the damage they did by countering the temptation to live by bread with the assertion that not bread, but the speaking of God, is what makes a man alive. Students of such things have frequently pointed to the many parallels existing between the temptation narrative in the Gospels and the temptation narrative in Genesis. Whatever may be the literary merits of this parallelization, it is theologically sound; for when tempted to prove His divine sonship by a miracle, Jesus preferred to take His stand as the Second Adam: "It is written, *Man* shall not live. . . ."

As in New Testament days, men will always seek a sign and marvel at a miracle; they will be taken with the spectacular and the miraculous. God help the Church if we ever permit the Tempter to succeed in substituting this standard of values for the standard Jesus sets down in this first temptation, not bread alone, but the Bread of Life, the bread which He broke beside the sea, the bread which does not pass away as did the manna of old, the bread by which all bread and all eating and drinking are sanctioned and made truly *epiousios*, the word of grace and mercy and pity which God spoke at diverse times through the Prophets, but which now for the last time He has spoken in His Son. By this bread man shall live, and in this bread is the source of the Church's life as well.

II

After failing in his first attempt to seduce Jesus by a temptation, the devil tried a second. In the first he had been rebuffed when Jesus refused to make bread of stones and quoted the Old Tes-

tament Scriptures to back up His refusal. Taking up where Jesus left off, the Tempter appears, as Bengel has it, "*sub specie grammateos*," in the form of a scribe. He makes his appeal now not to miracle nor to hunger, but to the most sacred things in the religious vocabulary of the pious Jew.

Note the progression in this second temptation. "Then the devil taketh Him up to the holy city" — to Jerusalem, the center of religious life for Jews all over the Graeco-Roman world, to the city which had such reverent association for every Jew, and specially for this Jew, since it was here that there occurred the one incident from His boyhood important enough to be remembered and recorded. But not only to the holy city — "and setteth Him on a pinnacle of the Temple" — in this holiest of holy cities, this was the holiest of holy buildings, the center of the center, the dwelling place of the glory of the Most High God, and the abode of His covenant presence.

But more: standing now in Jerusalem, and on the pinnacle of the Temple, the Tempter quotes the Psalter, matching the Lord's previous quotation with one of his own. To the holy building in the holy city he adds the Holy Book, the record of God's promises and actions for His people, thus summoning to the mind of Him whom he was tempting all the reverence which a son of the Torah felt for the Old Testament. And from the Old Testament he quotes a promise concerning angelic help, a promise with the echoes of the death cries in Sennacherib's camp and the wailing of Egypt over her first-born playing an obbligo, a promise of help from the mysterious but strong messengers who had so often intervened in the history of the Old Testament people.

The accumulated holiness of all these things — the holy city, the holy temple in that holy city, the Holy Scriptures quoted on top of that holy temple in that holy city, and the holy angels promised in those Holy Scriptures quoted on top of that holy temple in that holy city — the accumulated holiness of all these things was fairly overwhelming. Not the stomach hungry for bread, but the soul athirst for the Eternal, was the object of this temptation: not man's materialism, but his very religiousness was here addressed.

It is this that made the temptation so profound and our Lord's answer so telling. For in His answer Jesus based His refusal to

accede to the Tempter's request on that one Holy to whom the devil made no reference: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Holy city and holy temple and Holy Bible and holy angels—all were holy only by derivation from Him of whom the *Gloria in excelsis* correctly sings: "*Quoniam Tu solus sanctus, Tu solus Dominus*: Thou only art holy, Thou only art the Lord." Thus Jesus points to the fact, verified by the lives of the saints ever since, that man's deepest temptations to sin come not in his lower, but in his so-called "higher" nature, they are addressed not to his immoral urges, but to his moral and even religious urges. And in His reply Jesus points to the one way we can overcome these temptations, the holiness and the inviolability of God.

Of all the three temptations this one seems in many ways to strike closest to our life and work. For the sin of a false trust in holy things at the expense of our trust in God is a respectable and a pious sin. It is trust in things which are in themselves not only not evil, but good—things like the holy city and the holy temple and the Holy Bible and the holy angels—and, for that matter, theology, liturgy, synodical organizations, the holy ministry. All of these are holy, and yet none of them dare claim our trust for its own sake.

Now, no one of us is in danger of supposing that just because he is a theological student or an orthodox theologian or a member of the Missouri Synod or an ordained minister he can go jumping off buildings with impunity. But we are all in danger of supposing that because of our occupation with holy things we own a controlling interest in divine protection and can afford to neglect the sources and resources of that protection. For we have our holy cities, too; we have our holy places in those cities; we have our Holy Scriptures, and we all study them, at least professionally, every day; we all pray: "Let Thy holy angel be with me." And yet all of these holy things are the means of disgrace to which the Tempter had recourse when his first strategy had failed.

"Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God"—this is what Luther discovered when all the holy things, Holy Mother Church and Holy Father and sacred theology and even the Holy Bible had failed to give him peace: that any religious disposition which settles for less than God, that fastens upon anything holy except the

Holy One of Israel, is a surrender to the pious fraud of the impious and fraudulent Tempter. All other holiness except the holiness of God can become an idol unless He touches it in whom the holiness of God was revealed and made available. Because He fought off the attack of the Tempter, resisting him to the very death, we can enjoy the sustaining and hallowing presence of the Holy Spirit, the Sanctifier, who makes us holy and who also consecrates what could have been an idol and makes it holy in His service.

And so "we our earthly temples rear" and call them houses of God, because in them the Holy God makes us His own through Word and Sacrament. And we read our Scriptures and rightly call them holy, because they are they which testify of God's grace in Christ Jesus. And we hear the whirring of the angels' wings around us because we know that the God who has loved us in Christ preserves all His creation, and especially His new creation.

Yes, and we study theology and call it sacred because all theology is Christology and the message of His grace; we form synodical organizations because the tasks of His service demand our best and our united efforts; we enter the ministry because we can thereby serve Him. Holy things, all of these, and deeply to be cherished: because He has made them holy and promises to use them. But dangerous things all of these, and tools of the Tempter, if we ever begin to trust in them and not in Him who made them and sanctified them and without whom they would not be holy at all. Thou shalt not tempt the Lord Thy God, the Holy One, even with holy things!

III

The third and last temptation which the devil addressed to our Lord in the wilderness was in many ways more subtle than the previous two. No longer did he challenge the fact that Jesus was the Son of God or ask Him to prove this by a miracle or a demonstration of divine help. Instead he sought to strike a bargain with Jesus, to exchange the whole world for one small act of worship.

Certainly this looked like a good bargain and more than a fair exchange. Commentators have frequently noted the fact that the world was not the devil's to give and that it really belonged to the Lord. But they have often forgotten to note the power of this temptation precisely in that fact. For though He was rich, yet for

our sakes He became poor, depriving Himself of that very thing which the Tempter was now offering Him.

Imagine the good He could have done if He had had the entire world at His command, instead of a few followers in an obscure portion of the Roman Empire, if He had been able to use the untapped resources of that entire world for the spreading of His message, if Caesar and king and Oriental potentate and Greek philosopher and Mithraic priest had all been subject to Him. Just think of the mission possibilities involved in this exchange, to conquer the world for the Gospel — and all for one act of worship! Surely the most practical thing to do would have been to accept the bargain, to go through the motions of worship, and then to use the kingdoms of the world and all the glory of them for some good and sacred purpose. Prudence would have dictated that Jesus make this slight concession in order to gain the world. Instead He refused all of this with the summary dismissal: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve."

That looks like the ultimate in ivory-tower idealism, to be so squeamish when so much was at stake, an exchange that makes the sale of Manhattan Island for \$24.00 look like highway robbery. Didn't God give us our common sense to use in His service? And wasn't it common sense that when He permitted such an opportunity to come, He was thereby indicating that He wanted Jesus to take it? And Jesus said "No."

The Church since Jesus' day has often had more prudence and more common sense than He did, and has often accepted the trade. In the days of the persecutions, Christians were asked to offer up to the emperor just a pinch of incense. They didn't have to believe that the emperor was divine, all they were required to do was to go through the motions. A lot of them did. But those days are past; except for our brethren in Communist lands, twentieth-century Christians no longer worry about this problem. For ours is a "Christian country," where the requirements of good citizenship, social respectability, and practical common sense are the same as the requirements of the Christian life. And so today all of us are involved in the practicalities of compromise and concession, with the view, of course, to gaining a great good by a small compromise.

Like the sin of seeking the spectacular and of trusting in holy things rather than in God, so this sin of practical compromise is a constant temptation of the ministry. No devils come to claim our worship or to offer us the kingdoms of the world and all the glory of them. But we are constantly being confronted by the opportunity to gain a lot by conceding a little, just a pinch of incense. This opportunity takes various forms. It has even acquired a title: "an ethic of middle principles," which is a nice way of saying that, given the kind of world we have to deal with, we have to make allowances and strike bargains in order to get along.

"Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve" is the haunting reminder which our Lord would have us remember when these opportunities come along. The claim which God makes upon us is an exclusive and an absolute one, and it brooks no competition or compromise. He does not bid us be practical or sensible or successful; He bids us only to "know that the Lord is God alone, He can create and He destroy." And as we cannot worship anything above Him, so also we cannot worship anything in order thereby to worship Him. Nor dare we, like latter-day Fausts in clerics, strike a bargain with the devil in order thereby to advance the kingdom of God. Given the kind of world we have to deal with, all its kingdoms and the glory of them, we must hear again the thunder of the first and the only Commandment: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." No middle principles here, as though God permitted us to get at Him or to serve Him through the idols of our own making. Rachel left her father's house to serve the Almighty; but just to play safe, she carried a few vest-pocket deities, not to replace, merely to supplement, Jehovah. In like manner we nurse our little idols—the idols of self, of intellect, of numbers, of self-satisfaction in our ministry, of coming to terms for the sake of a greater good, of being practical when all that is required of a steward is that he be found faithful.

We need to be reminded again of the words of Paul to the Corinthians, that an idol has no existence except for the existence which the devil gives it; and this applies to our little Christian idols too. Jesus fought off the temptation of a little idolatry in exchange for a lot of success in order that we who bear His name

and claim His service might henceforth live not to ourselves, but to Him who died for us and rose again, and to Him alone.

The Cross serves to remind us how far God was willing to go in order to shatter the hold of idolatry upon us, to the length of giving up His only Son. It was for this that Christ came, that He might redeem us from the very sins with which He was faced in the temptation and lead us to proclaim the Word by which alone man can live, to trust in God and not in holy things, and to worship Him alone. The forgiveness of sins which He wrought was the gift for such a life in the Word, such a trust in God, and such an untarnished worship.

But the Tempter is not willing to give up. He failed in his attempt to win Jesus, but in us he finds more willing victims. He knows he cannot win us with base and coarse seductions; but he can win us, and often does, with the pious temptations to which our ministerial craft is peculiarly subject. May we fight him off, as did our Lord, with the power of the speaking of God, with the inviolability of the holiness of God, and with the singleness of the worship of God—all of these made ours in the victory over the devil which is the gift of His holy Cross.

St. Louis, Mo.

The Lotthers

Forgotten Printers of the Reformation

By W. G. TILLMANNS

THE name *Lotther* is so similar to that of our Reformer that it must arouse the curiosity of the reader when he finds this name recorded in Luther's correspondence. Yet most Luther biographies do not even mention this name, and those that do pass it over lightly. Thus the family which has rendered outstanding service to the cause of the Reformation is today all but forgotten.

A closer check will reveal that the Lotthers¹ printed most of Luther's earlier works and that in fact they were the chief publishers of the Reformation until the coming of Hans Lufft in the second half of the 1520's. Hans Lufft, the so-called Bible Printer, is well remembered today, but it must be stated that he neither printed the first editions of the New Testament nor many of the Old Testament² books when they were first published. As a matter of fact, Hans Lufft did not become the first printer of the Reformation until after 1529, when the last of the Lotthers had left Wittenberg. Thus during the most critical years of the Reformation, from 1518 until 1525 and 1529 respectively, most of the works of Luther were printed by the Lotthers. They had an important part in spreading the good news of the Reformation.

The three Lotthers who devoted themselves to this task were Melchior Lotther Senior and his sons, Melchior Junior and Michael.

The date of the birth of Melchior Senior is not known. He was born in Aue in the Saxon Vogtland. In the year 1491 he is well established as a printer's apprentice in Leipzig. Towards the close of the fifteenth century he marries Dorothea Kachelofen, daughter of a fellow printer, Conrad Kachelofen. He is granted the privilege of citizen of Leipzig some time later. He now enters with his father-in-law into joint operation of the latter's printery. Soon his father-in-law turned the printing shop over to him, but must have remained active in it for a long time to come, since we have a few books printed by Kachelofen until 1519. Lotther and his family,

however, move into the house in the Hainstrasse,³ while the father-in-law retires to a smaller one in the Nicolaistrasse.⁴ Besides the printery, Kachelofen owned a bookshop and a tavern. He retains the former until his death some twenty years later, but turns over the *Weinschank*⁵ to his son-in-law. This tavern was quite famous. When Luther came to Leipzig in 1519, he made it his headquarters during the disputation with Eck.

In due time Lotther became the foremost printer in the diocese of Meissen. Until 1520 he was the official printer of the bishop. But besides printing a great number of missals and breviaries, Lotther also became well known as an outstanding publisher of philosophical, philological, and theological works. One of his chief helpers in the Leipzig printing office was Hermann Tulich,⁶ who later became professor at Wittenberg. For some time a branch office was established in Meissen.

The most important event in Lotther's life, however, was his meeting with Luther. Since 1518 he had done some printing for the Reformer, and Luther was apparently so satisfied with the work of the Leipzig printer that he persuaded him to open another branch office in Wittenberg. This was done towards the end of 1519,⁷ after Luther had returned from the Leipzig disputation. Lotther's two sons, Melchior Junior and Michael, were sent to Wittenberg to become official printers for the university there.

There were several reasons for the opening of a branch office in Wittenberg. First of all, Luther wanted to have a reliable printer in town in order to be able to publish his writings as fast as possible after they had been written.⁸ In order to accomplish this, he had to consult with the younger Lotthers and to make necessary changes wherever needed. Secondly, Wittenberg needed a good printer. There had been a printer, Johann Grunenberg, since 1516.⁹ But his work was inferior. When Melanchthon came to Wittenberg to teach Greek, he found out to his dismay that no one could print Greek books. Therefore the Lotthers arrived in Wittenberg with three sets of type: Gothic, Latin, and Greek.¹⁰ As far as the Lotthers were concerned, there was another reason for establishing this branch office. Since the disputation between Luther and Eck, Duke George of Saxony had become the fiercest enemy of the Reformer, and the publication and dissemination of his books

were strictly forbidden. In spite of this strict injunction, however, the elder Lotther continued to publish Luther's books by thousands of copies and distributed them. But he did it anonymously. The elder Lotther remained in Leipzig until his death, which probably occurred in 1528. His last two publications, as far as we know, were the *Schirm- und schutzbüchlein der Diatriba wider Martin Luthers knechtlichen willen durch Erasmus von Roterdham* and the *Sachsenspiegel*.¹¹ Besides his outstanding work for the cause of the Reformation the elder Lotther is remembered as the man who established Leipzig as the printing center of Germany and as the first printer who used Gothic type for German books exclusively, and Roman type for Latin books. He is also the first publisher of Greek books in central Germany.

His two sons, Melchior Junior and Michael, established themselves in Wittenberg. Melchior, who signed his name "*der Jüngere*," openly embraced the cause of the Reformation, unlike his father, who remained cautiously a secret follower of Luther until the day of his death. Besides printing textbooks for the university, a task which did not occupy the full time of a printer, Melchior was kept busy printing practically all of Luther's longer and shorter treatises until 1524. From then on Hans Lufft takes over more and more of the work. Formerly Lufft was credited with the publication of many of the works which Lotther printed anonymously. But it has been well established that Lufft did not enter into Luther's work until much later, after the publication of the "*Neve Testament, Deutzsch, Vuitenberg*." Lotther even did the second edition¹² of the New Testament and signed his name to it.

That both Luther and Melanchthon appreciated the fine work which Lotther put out can be seen from passages in their correspondence. On Misericordias Domini, 1519, Luther wrote to Spalatin: "*Venit Melchior Lotterus instructus optimis formularum matricibus. . . paraturus apud nos officinam excusoriam instituere. . . Nobis id decorum, imprimis universitati nostrae, tum commodum auditoribus arbitramur, praesertim praesente Philippo, graecas literas et copiose et fideliter propagare cupiente.*"¹³ And Melanchthon writes to the Augustinian Lang in Erfurt: "*Est apud nos Lottherus TYPOGRAPHOS, per quem sacros et profanos scriptores excudemus.*" Until 1519 four students were kept busy

copying the Greek books which Melanchthon had brought along to Wittenberg. The Greek books which Lotther printed belong to the best that his shop has produced. In contrast to older prints they are clear and bound like modern school texts.

Lotther printed only a few Latin books, because Luther's German writings kept his presses busy.¹⁴ Among his German books he printed the "*Sermon von dem N. Test. d. i. von der heil. Messe*," 1520, and "*Von guten Werken*," 1520. He also began the printing of Luther's *Church and House Postil*, 1521, which he brought out in installments. After the publication of the New Testament, first and second editions and possibly a third edition, and the printing of a few books of the Old Testament,¹⁵ Lotther suddenly moved back to Leipzig, probably at the beginning of 1525.¹⁶ The reason for this transfer of his business is not quite clear. Some think that he wanted to help his father, who was sick; others that he became jealous of the competition of Hans Lufft. But there seems to be some evidence that Lotther had trouble in Wittenberg and thought it wise to leave town. Luther wrote about him to Spalatin on December 13, 1524: "*Melchiorum Lottherum audio quoque apud Principem esse male tractatum, quid obsecro opus est afflictionem addere afflicto? Parcamus etiam aliquando, satis habet poenae et mali. Quare esto mediator bonus, et si opus est, ut ipse scribam pro eo, lubens faciam.*"¹⁷ Whatever the outcome of this affair might have been, Lotther left Wittenberg shortly afterwards. He remained in Leipzig until his death, highly respected and prosperous. He also continued to print some of Luther's works. He died in 1542.

The younger of the two brothers, Michael Lotther, remained in Wittenberg and continued the printing shop. The two brothers had worked together most of the time, but we also have a few books that were printed by Michael alone. Michael continued with the publishing of the *Postil* until 1529, when he left Wittenberg and established his shop in Magdeburg. During the four years between his brother's departure and his own he published a number of Luther's works. He continued in Magdeburg and died there in 1554 or 1555. His printing became poorer as he advanced in years, but in spite of it he was swamped with orders. He, too, continued to take an active interest in the Reformation and printed

among others "*Auslegung der Evangelien von Ostern bis aufs Advent*," 1536; "*Die Gantze niedersächsische Bibel*," 1536; "*Apologia Flacii*," 1549; "*Lutheri Meinung von den Mitteldingen*," 1550; and "*Neue Zeytung . . . die sich . . . in Strassburg . . . wider auffrichtung. . . Bäpstlicher Messen, so man der Pfaffen Interim nennet, hat begeben*," 1551.¹⁸ Thus Michael Lotther was a partisan of the anti-Melanchthon faction within the Lutheran Church and took his stand with Flaccius. It may also be of interest to note that he and his little daughter, Regina, have entered the pages of German literature in Wilhelm Raabe's well-known story "*Unseres Herrgotts Kanzlei*," written in 1862.¹⁹

Luther, one recent biographer of the great Reformer said, did not accomplish the Reformation singlehanded. He had many helpers. The three Lotthers did their part, and therefore it is a pleasant task to rescue them from obscurity.

Dubuque, Iowa

FOOTNOTES

1. *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, Leipzig 1884, vol. 19, pp. 273 ff.
2. *Reu, Luther's German Bible*, p. 195.
3. Boehmer, *Road to Reformation*, p. 220. The translation "Hay Street," corresponds to the original "Hewstrasse." Later it was "Heunstrasse," now it is "Hainstrasse."
4. *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, Leipzig 1881, vol. 14, p. 781.
5. Boehmer, *op. cit.*, p. 278.
6. Works of Martin Luther, Holman Edition, vol. 2, p. 170, footnote.
7. Rade, *Dr. Martin Luthers Leben, Taten und Meinungen*, vol. 2, p. 530.
8. Boehmer, *op. cit.*, p. 261 f.
9. *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 19, p. 618.
10. Koestlin, *Martin Luther, sein Leben und seine Schriften*, vol. 1, p. 276.
11. *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 19, p. 274.
12. *Ibid.*, vol. 19, p. 276. See also *Reu, op. cit.*, p. 161, and Koestlin, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 563 f.
13. Epist. ed. Aurifaber, I, 164, quoted *ibid.*, vol. 19, p. 275.
14. Koestlin, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 564.
15. *Reu, op. cit.*, p. 195.
16. *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 19, p. 618.
17. Epist. ed. Aurifaber, vol. II, p. 232, quoted *ibid.*, vol. 19, p. 277.
18. *ibid.* vol. 19, p. 278.
19. Wilhelm Raabe, *Saemtliche Werke*, Berlin-Grunewald, n. d., Erste Serie, vol. 4.

HOMILETICS

EISENACH OLD TESTAMENT SELECTIONS

May 3	Ascension	Ps. 110:1-4	The Triumphant Christ
May 6	Exaudi	Psalm 42	The Redeemer Fills Our Whole Life
May 13	Pentecost	Ezek. 36:22-28	God Converts Men to Be His People
May 20	Trinity	Is. 6:1-8	God Our Creator, Redeemer, Guide
May 27	1 S. a. Tr.	Deut. 6:4-13	Use God's Word for His Sake

Sermon Study on Isaiah 6:1-8 for Trinity

While this text does not treat the doctrine of the Holy Trinity *ex professo*, to which this Sunday is dedicated, it presents one of the most glorious revelations in all Scripture of Him who is Three in One, and One in Three, and invites the pastor who preaches on this text to set the Triune God before his people in the majesty of His holiness and in the glory of His grace.

Though it does not stand at the beginning of the prophecies of Isaiah, it is almost certainly an account of the call of this man into the office of prophet, for it pictures a man of unclean lips (v. 5) as cleansed and entering into the service of the Thrice Holy as His messenger (vv. 7-8).

The time of the revelation is narrowly fixed in v. 1 as "*in the death year of King Uzziah.*" It must have taken place *before* the death of Uzziah, for the date of the vision which Isaiah saw is fixed "in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah" (Ch. 1:1).

In this death year of King Uzziah, Isaiah says, "*I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and the skirts of His robe (A. V., 'His train') filled the temple.*" Isaiah's *seeing* on this occasion was *prophetic vision*, so often referred to in the Scriptures. Cp. Dan. 8:2; Amos 7:8; 8; 2; Acts 10:11; Rev. 1:10-12. In this connection it should be remembered that prophets are also called *seers* in Scripture on account of this prophetic vision. Cp. 2 Sam. 24:11 (*chozeh*) and 1 Sam. 9:9 (*roeh*).

Delitzsch describes this prophetic *seeing* as follows: "Isaiah

saw, and that not when asleep and dreaming; but God gave him, when awake, an insight into the invisible world, by opening an inner sense for the supersensuous, whilst the action of the outer senses was suspended, and by condensing the supersensuous into a sensuous form, on account of the composite nature of man and the limits of his present state. This was the mode of revelation peculiar to an ecstatic vision. . . ."¹

In such a prophetic, ecstatic vision Isaiah saw the Lord (Hebrew: *eth adonai*). The designation *adonai* is used in the Old Testament of God only, never of human masters. It signifies the majesty of God as compared with weak, sinful man. The form is plural, even as the form *elohim*, so often used for God in the Old Testament, is plural.

This majestic "Lord," Isaiah, in prophetic vision, saw "sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and the skirts of His robe filled the temple." The question arises whether the vision is to be thought of as picturing God sitting in the Temple at Jerusalem. The Hebrew word *bekhal* is regularly used to designate the Temple at Jerusalem, even as it was at times used before the building of the Temple to signify the Tabernacle. Cp. 1 Sam. 1:9; 3:3. According to Gesenius² the word in a number of passages signifies, not the Temple at Jerusalem, but heaven itself. Such a passage is Ps. 11:4: "Jehovah is in His holy temple; His throne is in the heavens." Cp. also Micah 1: 2-3. . . . "let the Lord Jehovah be for a witness among you, the Lord from His holy temple. For behold, Jehovah is going forth from His place, and He will come down and tread upon the high places of the earth." Since heaven is the temple where Jehovah's throne is, we understand the temple in Is. 6:1 also of heaven. Isaiah, in prophetic vision, was granted a view of heaven itself, and there he saw God sitting, as befits His majesty, "on a throne, high and lifted up." The picture of God sitting upon a throne is frequent in Scripture. Cp. 2 Chron. 18:18; Ps. 9:4, 7; 11:4; *et al.* The throne is high and lifted up, as befits a great King. Cp. Solomon's throne, 1 Kings 10:18-20.

1. Clark's Foreign Theological Library, Keil and Delitzsch, *Isaiah*, Vol. I. Edinburgh, 1866, p. 189.

2. Gesenius, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1907. Boston and New York.

The description of the Lord upon His throne in heaven is completed by the note that "the skirts of His robe filled the temple." His robe, as befits the Lord of heaven and earth, emphasizes by its ample train the unsurpassed greatness of its wearer.

The picture is, as it must needs be if it is to be meaningful to men, highly anthropomorphic. What God said to Moses, Ex. 33:20, when Moses desired to see God's glory, remains true for Isaiah and all men in this mortal, sinful life: "Thou canst not see My face; for there shall no man see Me, and live." Therefore the vision of Jehovah must be anthropomorphic, and the human form, sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and the skirts of His robe filling the temple, both veil the glory which mortal eyes cannot endure and reveal it in a form understandable and bearable to the Prophet.

John 12:37-41 refers to this vision of Isaiah and identifies the Lord upon the throne with Jesus. Delitzsch aptly remarks: . . . "the incarnation of God is the truth embodied in all the Scriptural anthropomorphisms, and the name of Jesus is the manifested mystery of the name Jehovah."³ V. 2: "*Seraphim were standing over Him, six wings, six wings to one; with two he covered his face, with two he covered his feet, and with two he flew.*" The term *seraphim* as referring to heavenly creatures occurs only here in Scripture. Hebraists are divided on the question of its derivation and meaning. Some derive it from *seraph*, "to burn up, to consume with fire." This word is fairly common in Scripture. Cp. Is. 44:16; Lev. 13:52; and many others. The fiery serpents which God sent among Israel in the wilderness, Num. 21:6, are called *nechashim seraphim*. However, the idea of "fiery" does not seem to fit the seraphim in their role Is. 6:2. Gesenius⁴ derives the word here from a root *saraph* meaning "to be high, lofty, prominent," and says that the seraphim in our passage are so called "as being of elevated rank, princes." This fits our context, where they stand nearest to God, as the highest princes in an earthly royal palace might stand nearest the King.

The seraphim, in indefinite number, "were standing over Him," not over "it," as the A. V. has it. The "standing" should be thought of as the standing of servants, who are at the beck and call of their

3. *Op. cit.*, p. 190.

4. See Gesenius, *op. cit.*, sub *saraph*.

master when they stand, rather than describing a physical act, for, as the last words of our verse reveal, in a physical sense they were flying, not standing.

The seraphim are described as furnished with six wings each, for this is the meaning of "six wings, six wings to one." Angels in the New Testament are often, though not always (cp. Rev. 14:6), pictured without wings, as men. Cp. Mark 16:5; Luke 24:4; *et. al.* The seraphim in the vision are, however, equipped with six wings, and the purpose of the wings is shown. "With two he covered his face," for even the holy angels stand in awe of Jehovah and veil their faces from such majesty. "With two he covered his feet." Smith-Goodspeed⁵ translate "loins" instead of "feet." Cp. ch. 7:20, "hair of the feet," where certainly the "loins" or *pudenda* are intended. Gesenius denies that the word is to be understood of the *pudenda* in this passage. It must, however, be admitted that the word, so understood here, would yield good sense. Furthermore this use of the word occurs, as we have shown above, in the very next chapter, 7:20. If the word is so understood, a parallel may be found in Ex. 20:26. Everything here serves to emphasize the holiness and majesty of God whom the seraphim serve.

"And with two he flew," hovering about the throne, ready for instant service.

V.3: "*And this one cried to that one and said: 'Holy, holy, holy, Jehovah of Hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory.'*" The holiness of Jehovah, which is indicated by the covering of faces and feet on the part of the seraphim, is proclaimed by their antiphonal cry: 'Holy, holy, holy is the LORD of Hosts.'

The basic meaning of *qadosh* seems to be the equivalent of our English words "separate," "apart."⁶ The term "the Wholly Other," signifying God's absolute transcendence, is probably the best rendition of "the Holy One." "God's holiness manifests itself in its transcendence over all created things."⁷ Isaiah, Ch. 40, v. 25: "To

5. See Smith and Goodspeed, *The Bible, An American Translation*, Is. 6:2.

6. Eduard Koenig, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Stuttgart, 1922, states: "Der intransitive Grundstamm *qadesb* hat urspruenglich die Bedeutung 'abgesondert sein'" (p. 172 f.).

7. Theodore Laetsch, "The Holiness of God," *Proceedings of the Ev. Lutheran Synodical Conference*, 1940, p. 39 f. Cp. also F. Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, Concordia Publishing House, 1924, I, p. 561.

whom, then, will ye liken Me or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One," indicates that there is no human nor angelic standard by which God's power and wisdom can be measured.

The complete transcendence of God implies also God's absolute sinlessness and impeccability. "Negatively expressed, God's ethical perfection is God's transcendence above all that is sinful, His complete separation from all that is ethically wrong. . . . Positively stated, it is the absolute rightness and rectitude of all His actions in thoughts, words, and deeds."⁸ God's holiness as ethical purity is brought out in such classical passages as Lev. 11:43 f., where after the law respecting unclean meats it is stated: "Ye shall not pollute yourselves with these that you should be defiled therewith" . . . and: "Be ye holy, for I am holy," v. 45. So also in Lev. 19:2 and 20:26, where the formula "Be ye holy, for I am holy" is placed at the beginning and at the end of a section containing various laws against fornication, adultery, incest, idolatry, and other like crimes. In Deut. 23:14, after the law for removing human filth out of the camp, the words are added: "For Jehovah, thy God, walketh in the midst of thy camp. . . . Wherefore let thy camp be holy, that He behold no unclean thing in thee and turn away from thee."

The holiness of God both in its transcendence and its moral purity is so complete and so dazzling that even the holy seraphim may not behold it, but cover their faces.

Three times the seraphim pronounce the Lord "holy." The Church has from ancient times seen in the triple "holy" an indication of the Holy Trinity. Standing alone, the passage does not, and cannot, prove the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. That is done by the *sedes doctrinae*. But once the doctrine is established, it is but natural to see in the *Trisagion* an indication of the fact of the three holy Persons in the one Jehovah of Hosts.

Jehovah is called "Jehovah of Hosts." The name "Jehovah," which is etymologically explained Ex. 3:14, designates God as the living, eternal, immutable One.⁹

The added designation "of Hosts" deserves some attention. The Hebrew *sebaoth* means armies. The Bible speaks in two senses

8. Laetsch, *l. c.*, p. 46.

9. For a discussion of the name "Jehovah" with special reference to Luther's explanation see Pieper, *op. cit.*, pp. 462 ff.

of "heavenly hosts" or "hosts of heaven." 1 Kings 22:19; 2 Chron. 18:18; Ps. 103:21; and 148:2 (cp. also Luke 2:13) the reference is to angels. Is. 34:4; 40:26; *et al.* the term signifies the heavenly bodies.

In the name "Jehovah of Hosts" reference is to the angels, who are Jehovah's armies and do His bidding. 1 Kings 22:19 ff.; Ps. 103:20-21; cp. also 2 Kings 6:17, where the horses and chariots of fire that surround Elisha cannot well represent anything but the heavenly hosts, that is, the angels.

Returning to our picture, Isaiah sees Jehovah of Hosts, the great, exalted Lord of heaven and earth, sitting upon His throne in heaven, surrounded by the seraphim and acclaimed by them in antiphonal praise as the Thrice Holy, the clean, the pure, separate from all manner of uncleanness, of whatever sort it be.

The seraphim add: "Full is the whole earth of His glory." This can hardly refer to His being glorified in all the earth by men, for the Lord complains bitterly in Isaiah 1 that not even in Israel, where above all other nations His glory might be expected to dwell, was He honored. "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know, My people doth not consider" (Ch. 1:3). Rather we must think here of the wonders of creation (Ps. 19:1 ff.) and of the works of God in His government of mankind. Cp. Num. 14:21-24.

The vision made a deep impression upon Isaiah. Delitzsch says: "The whole Book of Isaiah contains traces of the impression made by this ecstatic vision. The favorite name of God in the mouth of the Prophet, *viz.*, "the Holy One of Israel," . . . is the echo of this seraphic *sanctus*."¹⁰

The crying of the seraphim had a number of effects. The first effects to be described were upon the temple itself, in which the vision takes place. V. 4: "*And the foundations of the sills trembled from the voice of him that cried, and the house was filled with smoke.*" The translation of *siphim* with "posts" by the A. V. is misleading. The word *saph*, as part of a building, means "sill, threshold." The sills on their part are laid on foundations called *ammoth*. The fact that the foundations of the sills trembled shows

10. Delitzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 192 f.

that the temple was shaken to its very foundations, not only in its superstructure, by the voice of the seraphim. Not terror on the part of the building, but the power of the voices of the seraphim is described. Furthermore, the house was filled with smoke. Some interpreters have thought of the cloud which filled the house of the Lord when the Ark of the Covenant had been placed in the Holy of Holies at the dedication of the Temple of Solomon (1 Kings 8:10-11). Others have explained the smoke by a reference to Rev. 8:3-4, where the prayers of the saints come with the smoke of incense before God. So Stoeckhardt takes it. "Nach dem Zusammenhang, in welchem von dem Lobgesang der Seraphim und dessen maechtiger Wirkung die Rede ist, haben wir diesen Rauch als Weihrauch, als Sinnbild der Anbetung zu fassen. Und da kurz zuvor von der Offenbarung der Herrlichkeit Gottes auf Erden gesagt war, so sind mit dem Rauchwerk wohl, wie Apok. 5, 8; 8, 3, 4, die Gebete der Heiligen auf Erden gemeint. Die Menschen auf Erden, die da auch die Herrlichkeit Gottes sehen, vereinigen ihre Stimmen mit den Stimmen der Engel und geben sammt den heiligen Seraphim dem dreimal Heiligen Preis, Ehre und Anbetung."¹¹

The vision and the cry of the seraphim, which shook the heavenly temple to its foundations, also shook Isaiah, who beheld the scene in a prophetic vision, to his foundations. V. 5: "*And I said: Woe to me, because I am destroyed (damam: to be dumb, silent, Niphal, to be destroyed, to perish), for I am a man, unclean of lips, and in the midst of a people unclean of lips I dwell, for my eyes have seen the King, Jehovah of Hosts.*"

In direct contrast to Jehovah, who is holy, pure, clean, too pure even for the seraphim to view with unshaded eyes, stands Isaiah, who is a man "unclean of lips." We know nothing of the personal life of Isaiah before he was called to be a prophet. But in the presence of the Holy One he deeply feels his own uncleanness and that of the people among whom he dwells. Perhaps with the words of God to Moses: "Thou canst not see My face: for there shall no man see Me, and live" (Ex. 33:20) in mind, Isaiah cries

11. G. Stoeckhardt, *Der Prophet Jesaia*, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., p. 66.

out that he is destroyed. He must die because he has seen God. But the purpose of the vision was not Isaiah's destruction. V. 6: "*And there flew to me one of the seraphim; and in his hand a coal; with tongs he had taken it from off the altar.*" The word *rispah*, which we have translated "coal," means also a hot stone, such as the ancients at times used for baking. However, since baking operations can hardly be thought of as being carried on at altars, we prefer to translate with the Septuagint and the Rabbins, "a coal."

With this coal "*he touched upon my mouth and said: Behold, this has touched thy lips, and thy iniquity has departed, and thy sin is covered*" (v. 7). The Prophet had lamented over unclean lips. It is his lips, therefore, that are touched with the coal from the altar for cleansing. Both verbs used for the forgiveness of sins are significant. The first, *sar*, means "to depart." When iniquity has been forgiven, it has departed, it is no longer with the sinner. The second, *tekhuppar*, means, literally, "it has been covered," therefore God no longer sees it or regards it.

It is significant that forgiveness and cleansing come to the Prophet from the altar. God has provided an altar on which forgiveness and cleansing may be found for all unclean lips and hearts and lives on earth, the Cross on which His only-begotten Son was sacrificed for the redemption of all mankind. (Heb. 13:10 ff.; Eph. 5:2; Heb. 10:10.) God, the perfectly Holy, who wants man to be holy, has provided a vicarious holiness for sinners through the altar of the Cross. And even as the seraph touched the lips of the Prophet with a coal from the altar and cleansed him, so God cleanses sinners with the blood of Christ. Then they need no longer tremble and despair at the sight, and even at the thought of the Thrice Holy, but may approach His throne with eagerness and confidence.

V. 8: "*And I heard the voice of the Lord saying: Whom shall I send, and who will go for Us? And I said: Behold me, send me!*" Here the purpose of the vision becomes apparent. Jehovah is seeking someone to send on a mission. And this time it is not to be one of the seraphim or of any other order of angels. He desires a *human* instrument. The Prophet has understood. And with a will-

ingness and confidence born of the consciousness that his sins are forgiven, he offers himself. "Behold me, send me!"

This is Isaiah's call to the prophetic office, which he is to exercise under four kings (Ch. 1:1). His message for the first is not to be the message of forgiveness, but a terrible message of Law and of doom, as the next verses show, but by and by he will be permitted also to extend to Israel those sweet Gospel messages which earn him the title "The Evangelist of the Old Testament."

Homiletic Use: If this text is used on Trinity Sunday, the preacher may, since the doctrine of the Trinity is not treated *ex professo* in the passage, briefly set forth the doctrine in its salient features in the introduction to the sermon on the basis of the *sedes doctrinae*, and then speak of the majesty and of the holiness of God in the body of the sermon. The following outline might be used:

Theme: Holy, Holy, Holy Is the Lord of Hosts!

- I. His holiness (transcendence and purity) is such that no creature can stand before Him.
 - A. The holy seraphim hide their faces, lest they see Him, and their feet, lest they offend the Holy One, v. 2.
 - B. Isaiah cries that he, a man of unclean lips, is undone for having seen Him, v. 5.
 - C. As for the rest of mankind, Mal. 3:2 applies.
- II. But the Thrice Holy Himself has prepared a cleansing, which enables sinners to stand before Him and to enter His service.
 - A. Vv. 6-7. The cleansing of the Prophet's lips with a coal from the altar.

The forgiveness of sins for all sinners through the sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross.
 - B. V. 8. The Prophet's call and his joyous response.

The Christian's call to service in the Kingdom and his joyous response. _____

If a more general treatment is desired, the preacher may, in his introduction, show that agnostics maintain that God, if indeed there is a God, is unknown and unknowable. He may then show that

God has, in fact, revealed Himself to man from ancient times, that in these revelations of Himself He condescended to our frail human understanding, assuming human form (anthropomorphism). From here the preacher could lead over to the specific revelation of God in the text.

Theme: Behold Thy God!

- I. As king of heaven and earth
- II. As the Holy One
- III. As the Savior of Sinners

FRED. KRAMER

THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER

OBJECTIVES OF MINISTERIAL TRAINING

The Board for Higher Education of the Missouri Synod is currently engaged in implementing the re-organized program of ministerial training adopted by the convention last summer. The twofold objective of re-organization is, briefly stated, to lead the ministerial student progressively to spiritual maturity and to enable him to acquire the necessary competence for the present-day ministry. The first objective is intangible, and its implementation will require not only much planning, but also consecrated teachers and students, and especially a rich measure of the Holy Spirit. The second objective is of a curricular nature. The construction of an effective and thoroughly integrated curriculum is as great an undertaking as, probably greater than, the erection of the most up-to-date physical plant. The men charged with implementing this latter objective fortunately have various sources on which they can draw for guidance, such as our own experience of the past century and the pattern followed by others, both in America and in Europe.

There are, broadly speaking, two philosophies of the ministerial curriculum. The one argues that since the Church is concerned with preparing men for the parish ministry, the curriculum should be designed so that it will directly and immediately lead the candidate into the practical ministry. The implications of this philosophy for a ministerial curriculum are obvious. The other philosophy is that theology is primarily a science and that the goal of the ministerial training program is intended first of all to prepare "good theologians." The former philosophy is emphasized more or less in America, while the latter apparently dominates in European circles. It seems, however, that the solution lies in finding a happy medium between these two philosophies.

We submit the following program of ministerial training recently adopted by the Hessian-Nassau Church,¹ in the hope that it may stimulate some discussion on a matter which is of such vital significance to the future of our Church. The program adopted by the Hessian-Nassau Church is typical of the European practice in general. The ministerial training program comprises the following three stages:

¹ *Amtsblatt der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland*, November 15, 1950.

1. A thorough humanistic training, usually offered in the nine-year course of the Gymnasium, coupled with a carefully devised screening process. The successful completion leads to the *Abitur*, approximately the equivalent of the American A. B.

2. Four years of theology given by the theological faculty at the university. The method of teaching and the content of courses are on the graduate level. Upon completion of eight semesters of theological studies the ministerial student takes the "first examination." This examination is given by the university or the consistory and covers the entire pensum of the four years. There are no semester examinations. No professional degree is given at this level.

3. Upon submission of his "certificate of graduation" the church officials direct the candidate to a "practical seminary" to take such practical courses as Homiletics, Catechetics, Liturgics. In some instances an internship is combined with the work at the practical seminary, in others an additional year of internship is required. The candidate submits to his "second examination," which is given by the church authorities to determine the candidate's qualifications for the practical ministry.

A synopsis of the Guidelines for the four-year program of theological study prior to the first examination adopted by the Hessian-Nassau Church is as follows:

Bible Study. The candidate is expected to have a thorough knowledge of all Biblical books.

General Knowledge. Because the preacher of the Gospel is to make the Gospel effective in all strata of human society, the candidate is expected during his stay at the university to take a number of electives in non-theological areas.

Old Testament. The candidate must have a thorough knowledge of Hebrew; have pursued exegetical studies of such Old Testament Books as Genesis, Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Minor Prophets, and Psalms. A comprehensive knowledge of the history of Israel, Introduction to the Old Testament, acquaintance with the theology of the Old Testament with reference to the religious and cultural contacts of Israel, and the completion of several seminars dealing with specific problems are required.

The New Testament. A thorough knowledge of the Greek language is mandatory, as well as having repeatedly read cursorily the Greek New Testament. The candidate must also have studied exegetically the Four Gospels, Romans, and other important New Testament Letters.

He must be acquainted with New Testament isagogical problems, Hellenism and Judaism, and the theology of the New Testament.

Church History and History of Dogma. The candidate is expected to have a comprehensive grasp of the entire field of church history and of history of dogma. In addition he is expected to have completed several seminars dealing with specific problems in both areas.

Systematic Theology. The candidate must show that he is at home in the fields of symbolics, dogmatics, and ethics. The candidate is expected to be acquainted with the entire field of Christian dogmatics with all its problematics, to be familiar with the Lutheran and Reformed confessional writings, the chief writings of the Reformation and Old-Protestant dogmaticians. He must have completed at least one seminar dealing with some of the outstanding dogmaticians of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Philosophy. The candidate must be acquainted with the problematics of Occidental philosophy and is expected to have studied at least one significant philosopher thoroughly.

Pedagogy. The candidate must know the history of education in general and be familiar with one or more educators.

Practical Theology. A knowledge of the history and basic problems in the areas of liturgy, the Christian sermon, Christian education, and church law is expected.

F. E. M.

REPORT ON THE LWF CONVENTION IN 1952

In *Information Service of the LWF* (January 10) Dr. S. C. Michelfelder, executive secretary of the Lutheran World Federation, with headquarters in Geneva, reports in some detail regarding the convention of the LWF to be held in Hannover in the summer of 1952. We quote:

"The famous *Marktkirche* is now being rebuilt and should be ready. It is planned to hold a great service of Holy Communion there. It will seat 2,500 people. Then for the Assembly itself, we are promised the *Stadt-Halle*, with its many rooms in connection. One huge auditorium will hold 5,000 to 6,000 people. Another beside it, the *Niedersaechsische Halle* (a brand-new auditorium) will seat 3,000. Abundant smaller rooms are available for sectional meetings and smaller committees. Dining facilities will be adequate for any number of people. Then there is an open-air stadium, where over 50,000 people may assemble. It is planned to hold the closing mass meeting there, to which the general public will be invited. Hannover already has 1,500

beds available in hotels, and we are assured that there are 150,000 additional beds available now in private homes.

"The German National Committee will sponsor the preparation for two sections of the program, Section III (Inner Missions) and Section VI (Women's Work). The U.S.A. Committee will sponsor Section IV (Evangelism and Stewardship) and Section V (Youth and Students). The Swedish National Committee will sponsor Section I (Theology) and the Federation itself Section II (World Missions). The general theme for the whole Assembly is: 'The Living Word in a Responsible Church.'"

From a German bulletin which also reports on plans for the convention in Hannover we quote the following grateful German sentiments:

"In the course of our history of blood and tears we Germans have become very largely the recipients. We are humbled at the thought of the great sacrifices of love which Christians of our faith have brought to help us in our distress. In our common repentance, in our mutual forgiveness, our faith has passed through a fiery trial. In the future lying before us we Germans shall have to demonstrate that we were ready not only to receive, but are ready also to give and to serve others with the gifts which we have received from God. . . . In this sense we joyfully look forward to the convention of the Lutheran World Federation in Hannover in 1952.

P. M. B.

ROME AND EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANITY

In a German clergy bulletin dated February 1 and published under the auspices of the United Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Germany, *Oberkirchenrat* Dr. Huebner publishes an article titled "The Roman Church Opposes Ecumenical Co-operation." Since we believe this article to be of considerable theological significance, we are herewith submitting it in translation. Dr. Huebner writes:

"We note a clear line running through the last three formal utterances of the Pope in Rome regarding the relation of the Roman Church to non-Roman Christendom.

"The *Monitum*, dated June 6, 1948, by taking recourse to Canon 1325, Paragraph 3, of the *Codex Juris Canonici*, emphatically forbade all non-controlled and supra-confessional discussions and conferences and warned against Roman co-operation with the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam in 1948.

"*De Motione Oecumenica*, dated December 20, 1949, carefully regulated discussions and meetings of Catholics with non-Catholics, placed

them under the special supervision of the Holy See, and granted them status only in view of the consideration that apostates from the Roman Church might be won back to the only saving Church.

"The encyclical *Humani Generis*, dated August 12, 1950, emphatically calls to order Roman theologians who, moved by a misguided love of peace, have dealt gently with separatists and errorists, and insists on their absolute obedience to the infallible teaching office of the Roman Church.

"The keystone in this development was placed on November 1, 1950, when the Pope declared the dogma of the bodily assumption of Mary. For him who is informed it is no secret that in the proclamation of this new dogma the Pope was concerned not so much about doing honor to Mary as about doing honor to himself as the infallible teacher of the Church. For the first time the Pope here employed the dogma of infallibility, declared in 1870, and, from the Evangelical point of view, proclaimed a grievously false judgment. But more: he disregarded the principle which has guided all Christian churches, and for a time also the Roman Church, viz., that all doctrines of the Church must be grounded in the Apostolic witness of Jesus Christ. By virtue of a false authority vested in him and contrary to the witness of the Holy Scriptures and the early Christian tradition, the Pope proclaimed a new dogma, which every Roman Christian who wishes to save his soul must believe.

"From the above documentation, we draw two inferences:

"1. Whereas in these turbulent and dangerous times most other Christian churches throughout the world believe the hour to have come when they must find a way to get into closer relationship with one another, the Roman Church regards it as the need of the hour to fortify its own front and to suppress even the most cautiously made efforts to effect some understanding between the Roman Church and the various Christian bodies. In Rome the ecumenical movement is interpreted as a sign of weakness within Protestant Christianity. Rome hopes to promote her prestige by disapproving of every form of *rapprochement* with other Christian churches. Rome believes her strongest weapon to be the absolute authority of the Pope as the teacher of the Church. Therefore she is concerned about sharpening this weapon and, at the same time, about developing the Roman Church into the most perfect organization with every means of propaganda, of pomp, and pressure on the consciences. The almost unanimous and spirited reception of the new dogma in the entire Roman Catholic world . . .

clearly shows how far the Roman Church has moved in the direction of achieving its goal.

"2. On the other hand, the encyclical *Humani Generis* is evidence that behind the external façade of pomp and propaganda not everything in the Roman Church is as perfect as it appears to be. There are, obviously, among Roman theologians not a few who are not in a mood to shut themselves off completely from modern currents of thought. In addition to the external enemies of the Church, such as immanentism, idealism, and existentialism, there are in the Church itself enemies who are clamoring for a reform of theology and its method, who question the absolute sovereignty of the Thomistic system, who are interested in new approaches to Scriptural exegesis, and who, above other concerns, are not subordinating themselves readily to the teaching authority of the Church. All of these non-conformist spirits are exposed in this encyclical and called to order and to a return to sound doctrine. This encyclical operates, to say it crudely, like the purges resorted to in totalitarian regimes and will certainly not miss its objective. . . ."

In a closing note, Dr. Huebner expresses the hope that in spite of these clear utterances of the Pope, the Church of Rome will not shut the door completely and that it may still be possible for Evangelical theologians to carry on discussions with Catholic bishops, as they have been doing in recent years.

Dr. Huebner's analysis coincides largely with our own. There can be no doubt that the Roman Church is closing its ranks. In our country it is no longer on the defensive, but has taken the offensive and is slowly but surely realizing objectives which only a generation ago lay altogether outside its reach. Yet the way to offset its influence is not the almost frantic promotion of Protestant union at any cost, but the proclamation by the Christian churches of the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ and humble submission to the Savior's direction. Fortunately, also our Lutheran confessional writings are eminently relevant and clearly indicate how we are to meet the pretensions of the Roman Church. May we study them!

P. M. B.

CATHOLICS AND LUTHERANS ON SECRET SOCIETIES AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

With manifest joy the *Catholic Mind* (November, 1950) quotes from the *Catholic Transcript* a lengthy opinion on two resolutions of our Milwaukee convention held in 1950. We read (quoting in part):

"It [the convention] served notice on its adherents of the danger of secret societies and the incompatibility of membership in these and

membership in the Lutheran Church. Many lodges, the church is saying in effect, are but a secularistic substitute for religion. They have a creed which denies or ignores the Holy Trinity, the divinity of Christ, and the atonement. This is completely and irreconcilably at variance with the doctrine of the Lutheran Church. To subscribe simultaneously to the former and the latter is impossible. Therefore Communion will be denied to those who belong to such lodges; and the church goes on to warn against Freemasonry's absorption of the young. . . . A similar stand has been taken by the Catholic Church for centuries. It is significant surely that the Lutherans have accepted it as their own."

With regard to religious education the opinion states: "The convention went on record as saying that the separation of church and state, which is traditional in America, does not demand the exclusion of religion from the education of children. The state, declare the Lutherans, can be on friendly terms with the church without interfering with its functions or breaking down the distinction between the two institutions. In fact, the state should cooperate with the church wherever the welfare of the nation demands such cooperation. The First Amendment of the Constitution, the Lutherans argue, merely prohibits the establishment of an official national church; it does not mean that the state is to be indifferent or hostile to religion, nor does it prevent the state from cooperating with and befriending religion on a non-preferential basis.

"The Lutherans urge the building and maintenance of parochial schools for the children of their sect[?]. While Christian parents should be willing to pay the expenses involved in founding and maintaining Christian schools, they say, the state should give some consideration to the children who do not have the opportunity to attend such schools. Evidently the Lutherans would ask no assistance for children attending parochial schools. While we agree with them that the founding and maintaining of parochial schools should be the financial responsibility of the members of the church, we think that children attending them should not be deprived of benefits paid for by everyone alike, but discriminatingly and unjustly withheld from some children."

It should be stated in fairness to our Church that it has not simply adopted the stand taken by the Catholic Church for centuries against secret societies, for its objections to anti-Christian secret societies are based on Scripture and not on papal pronouncements so that there is an entirely different motivation. There is also considerable difference (despite apparent agreement) between the Catholic view of Church and State co-operating in religious education and our own. We cannot

expatiate on the matter here, but certainly there is nothing of the animosity in our stand on the question which shows itself in the writer's closing words:

"Here is proof that others than Catholics are beginning to recognize the error and injustice which has been foisted upon the nation by a few zealots for secularism. As the consequences of this trick become plainer and more general, the ranks of those objecting to it will increase and grow more articulate and active. The present situation is not irreversible; it will be changed."

Perhaps Luther's: "Ihr habt einen andern Geist denn wir," would help to describe the difference.

J. T. MUELLER

"LET FREEDOM RING"

This is the title of a brilliant article by Dr. Edward B. Willingham (Baptist) published in *The Watchman-Examiner* (February 15). Dr. Willingham pleads with Americans not to take religious freedom for granted, but rather to be on the constant alert lest they lose it. Following a brief review of the spread of discrimination, intolerance, and persecution shown by Catholics toward Protestants in Italy, Spain, Bolivia, and other Latin American countries, the author quotes extensively from an article which appeared April 3, 1948, in the Italian Jesuit review *La Civiltà Cattolica* and which clearly shows the attitude of Catholics toward Protestants. We are taking the liberty of reproducing the pertinent paragraphs:

"The Catholic Church being convinced, by reason of her divine prerogatives, that she is the one true Church, claims for herself alone the right to freedom, for this right may only be possessed by truth, and never by error. Where the other religions are concerned, she will not take up the sword against them, but she will ask that, by lawful means worthy of the human creature, they shall not be allowed to propagate false doctrines. Consequently, in a State where the majority of the people are Catholic, the Church asks that error shall not be accorded a legal existence, and that if religious minorities exist, they shall have a *de facto* existence only, not the opportunity of spreading their beliefs. Where material circumstances—whether the hostility of a government or the numerical strength of the dissenting factions—do not allow of this principle being applied in its entirety, the Church requires that she shall have all possible concessions, confining herself to accepting as the least of all evils the *de jure* toleration of other forms of worship. In other countries the Catholics are obliged to ask for full liberty for all, resigning themselves to living together where

they alone had the right to live. The Church does not in this way give up her thesis, which remains the most imperative of all laws, but adapts herself to the hypothesis, which must be taken into account on the material plane. Hence extreme horror on the part of the Protestants, who hold it up against the Catholics that they withhold freedom, indeed *de facto* toleration, from others when they are in the majority, and on the other hand demand it as a right when they are in the minority.

"The Catholic Church would be betraying her mission if she were to proclaim, either in theory or in practice, that error can have the same rights as truth; especially when the highest duties and interests of man are at stake. The Church can feel no shame at her intransigence as she asserts it in principle and carries it out in practice, though the areopagus of the nations of today may smile pityingly or rage against it as tyrannical."

In view of the above, Dr. Willingham rightly comments: "The members of the Society of Jesus, for which the article quoted was written, are recognized as expressing the normal attitude of the Roman Catholic Church."

P. M. B.

WARNING AGAINST LODGES

"A Pastor Looks at the Lodge" is the title of a timely article published in *Sunday School Times* (October 28, 1950) by Rev. Paul Gerard Jackson, who was pastor of a Baptist church, but is now engaged in evangelism and Bible teaching. Rev. Jackson points out that while evangelists and revivalists, as also some ministers, deal unsparingly with a variety of other sins, they, with rare exceptions, let secretism severely alone. If they mention it at all, they do it with the qualification that the lodge is all right in its place, but must be kept subordinate to the house of God and that the Church of Christ must come first.

However, so the writer continues, church and lodge are incompatible. This is true despite the fact that many congregations dedicate several services a year to lodges, for such services are held in praise of the lodge, and not in criticism of its religion. When the author of the article attempted this years ago, many members left the church in protest against their pastor's attitude, having first vainly agitated to have him removed from his office.

Lodgism, Rev. Jackson contends, is a pseudo faith which, while boasting of belief in God and emphasizing morality, comes to many as a substitute for the church, initiating its members into profounder mysteries than the simple faith which their church provides. Secretism

thus constitutes a system of religion which negatives Christ and nullifies His Gospel, while at the same time it offers a way to eternal life and happiness of its own.

The writer admits that some lodges are little more than mutual-aid and insurance organizations, but states that such secret orders as the Freemasons and the Odd Fellows are religious systems with elaborate rituals and definite doctrines. He writes:

It can easily be demonstrated that such secret orders as Freemasonry require their initiates to take oaths in their lodge ceremonies that are blasphemous. They also subject many of the historical and symbolical portions of the Bible to a perverted and profane representation utterly repugnant to Christian sensibility. It can furthermore be shown that Freemasonry in several instances wickedly dishonors our blessed Savior by actually striking out the sacred and saving name of Jesus Christ from certain familiar New Testament Scriptures, a mutilation of Holy Writ which not even a Modernist who disbelieves in our Lord's deity would care to perpetrate. The same unholy offense is committed in the case of several well-known Christian hymns: the name of Christ must be removed before they can be suitably sung in Masonic ceremonies.

Since so much can be shown, then it is certainly no exaggeration to characterize such systems of syncretism as satanic. And it is the plain duty of every Christian pastor and leader to summon God's people to separation from these lodges if ever we are to expect the blessing of God in spiritual power upon our church and nation. Said D. L. Moody:

"I do not see how any Christian, most of all a Christian minister, can go into these secret lodges with unbelievers. They say they can have more influence for good, but I say they can have more influence for good by staying out of them and then reproving their evil deeds. Abraham had more influence in Sodom than Lot had. If twenty-five Christians go into a secret lodge with fifty who are not Christians, the fifty can vote anything they please, and the twenty-five will be partakers of their sins. They are unequally yoked together with unbelievers. 'But, Mr. Moody,' some say, 'if you talk that way, you will drive all the members of secret societies out of your meetings and out of your churches.' But what if I did? Better men will take their places. Give them the truth anyway, and if they would rather leave their churches than their lodges, the sooner they get out of the churches the better. I would rather have ten members who are separated from the world than a thousand such members. Come out from the lodge. Better one with God than a thousand without Him. We must walk with God, and if only one or two go with us, it is all right. Do not let down the standard to suit men who love their secret lodges or have some darling sin they will not give up."

Nothing need be added to what is here said. Lutheran pastors will of course not approach the problem in a legalistic manner, but with such evangelical persuasiveness as aims to get the member out of the lodge and not out of the church. If, however, all evangelical methods fail, then church discipline must be applied in accordance with Matthew 18. But even such disciplinary measures are the proclamation of the divine Word and have as their objective the saving of the soul.

J. T. MUELLER

THE OVERWHELMING EVIDENCE OF MONOTHEISM
IN PRIMITIVE RELIGION

The seventh volume of Father Wilhelm Schmidt's (S. V. D.) *opus magnum* *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee* (Band VII, 3. Abteilung: *Die Religionen der Hirtenvoelker, II: Niloten und Synthese mit Hamiten und Hamitoiden*. Muenster, Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung. DM 42.50) is being reviewed and studied in our country. The *International Review of Missions* (October, 1950) discusses extensively and thoroughly the views which Father Schmidt projects in his new and profound study. We read (in part):

"For over twenty-five years Father Schmidt has indefatigably carried on an investigation of the religion of peoples of the simpler cultures. Six volumes in this series, issued between 1920 and 1935, dealt with *Urvoelker*. In the seventh he has turned from primitive to primary culture groups, that is, from the food-gatherers to the food-rearing peoples of N. E. Africa. Now this volume deals with the neighboring Nilotes and compares their religion with that of the Hamites and Hamitoids.

"In all his research the learned author is concerned to establish and illustrate what he considers proven fact and not mere hypothesis, namely, that the farther back one goes in human history, the clearer the belief in one supreme God — monotheism — becomes, and that as cultures developed, this pristine belief was overlaid, obscured, corrupted by the growth of animism, spiritism, and magic. . . .

"Although the primitive idea of God is obscured at later stages, careful analysis succeeds in discovering what effectively survives of that idea. . . .

"For his data Father Schmidt relies on published and unpublished material collected by ethnographers and missionaries, Roman Catholic and non-Roman Catholic. He appears to treat the material with scrupulous fairness, while subjecting it, especially where it is at variance with itself and with his convictions, to critical analysis. . . . Much space

is given to mythology, and here it is interesting to note that some Nilotes share with the Bantu the myth of the origin of death and the myth of the Tower built up toward heaven. In one variant the fall of the tower is succeeded by the linguistic dispersion of mankind.

"Against many older writers who regarded Nilotic gods as otiose, unreachable, and not worshiped, Father Schmidt concludes that in most of the tribes there is a living and even intimate cult, with direct as well as indirect approach to the Supreme Being, by means of prayers and offerings. He, the Creator, is also the Founder and Guardian of Moral Law, breaches of which He punishes."

The Nilotes number about two million. They inhabit the region of the Upper Nile, extending from the southern Anglo-Egyptian Sudan into Uganda. The most widely spread divine name is *Jok* (Yok), which Father Schmidt regards as standing for a personal deity, while others consider it to be the denomination of a "neutral power permeating the universe, neither well nor badly disposed toward mankind unless made use of by man."

Father Schmidt's work goes far to support the argument of Christian Apologetics that monotheism has not stemmed from animism, polytheism, and the like, but that animism, polytheism, and other low cult patterns are degraded forms of worship brought about by a decadence of religious and moral thought in man. J. T. MUELLER

CHRISTIANITY IN AFRICA

Theology Today (January, 1951) reviews the report of Bishop Stephen Neill of the World Council of Churches on the growth of Christianity in Africa, which is based on his recent visit to that no longer dark continent. It comments:

It was the newness of everything Christian in Africa that made its strongest impression upon him. Few settlements were to be found in Africa before 1850. For instance, Uganda today has over half a million non-Roman Christians and possibly more Roman Catholic Christians, and yet on the Sunday Bishop Neill preached in the great cathedral of Namirembe, one of the worshipers was an aged and distinguished chief who could look back to the time when there was not a single Christian in Uganda.

It is only fifty years ago that the first missionary party entered the city of Kano in northern Nigeria. The first baptism among the people living in the highlands of Kikuya took place in 1906. Of a group of 28 theological students in Nigeria, 22 of them had been baptized during school days, and only six were children of Christian parents. After 400 years of Christian missionary work in India only one person

in forty is a Christian, whereas after a little less than a century of mission work in Africa, one person in nine is a Christian.

Christian missions play a large role in the educational life of Africa. "Three-quarters of the education of young Africans is in the hands of Christian missions." . . . Three-quarters of the students attending the four African university colleges are evangelical Christians, and the remaining one-quarter are Roman Catholics, Muslims, and pagans. The Church faces a promising future in the field of higher education and the training of Africa's leaders.

The gravest problem Bishop Neill finds in the areas of leadership and the relation of Christian living to old pagan fears, practices, and relationships.

J. T. MUELLER

A MONUMENT TO HIS CHRISTIAN FAITH

That Noah Webster was an erudite scholar is perhaps known to the majority of educated persons today; but that he was a believing Christian and that by his books he endeavored to inculcate upon his many readers the truths of Christianity is no doubt little known. Dr. Ernest Gordon in the *Sunday School Times* (January 13, 1951) offers the following short paragraph on the tribute which Webster paid to the Bible in his writings. We read:

"The Bible and the Dictionary" represents a fresh and unfamiliar trail which has been explored by the Rev. J. S. Potter, who reports on it in the *Presbyterian Tribune*.

Noah Webster's great work was a monument to his Christian faith. Because he knew that his dictionary would be widely used by schools and colleges and in homes where Christ and the Bible are revered, he chose, wherever possible, Scripture quotations to illustrate English usage and idiom.

In the *Webster International* of 1934 there are by actual count 2,025 Bible verses and Biblical references. In earlier editions the number was even greater. Every book of the Bible is represented, besides the Apocrypha. Christian ideas are carefully defined. For example, there are nine separate comments on faith and a long paragraph is added on evangelical, or justifying, or saving faith, summed up as "that firm belief of God's testimony and of the truth of the Gospel which influences the will and leads to an entire reliance on Christ for salvation." Bible verses quoted are Rom. 5:1; Heb. 11:6; 2 Cor. 5:7; Rom. 10:10; Gal. 1:23; Rom. 3:3; 14:22; Deut. 32:20.

Writing to his daughter in 1835, Webster declared his faith in the truth of the Scriptures and his cheerful commitment to the Savior, on whom he rested all his hope. Webster's blue-backed *Speller* was his most popular and widely known book. In 1880 Appleton the publisher spoke of it as having "the largest sale of any book in the world

except the Bible." For forty years it was sold at the rate of a million copies annually.

But Webster thought of his crowning work as a Revision of the Bible into the American idiom (now out of print). He spent five years on this enterprise, anticipating the many "modern English" versions of later times. This work is all-too-little known and appreciated.

J. T. MUELLER

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE ENGLISH FREE CHURCHES

Under this heading, Professor Nathaniel Micklem, principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, offers a thoughtful article on the English union movement and its problems in *Theology Today* (January, 1951).

Just now the movement apparently has reached an impasse, aggravated largely by the inauguration of the United Church of South India, which has brought to light in a special way the difficulties that face the Anglican Church when it contemplates union with Free Churches which are so differently oriented to doctrine and church polity. We are not interested in the details of the problem, but there are several phases of the project which obviously are applicable to other union endeavors. For clarification we quote a few sentences from the able discussion:

Churches can only come into close relationship with each other on the basis of a common faith. There was some difficulty here on both sides. It is not altogether easy to convince Anglicans, who lay great stress upon creedal orthodoxy, that those Free Churches, such as the Baptist and Congregationalist, which are committed to no formal written standards of faith, are reliably orthodox, expressing their faith in terms of a covenant rather than of creedal subscription. The Free Churches on the other hand, being more concerned with living faith than with formal orthodoxy, do not find it very easy to assert of all parts of the Church of England that it is sound in matters of faith. But while there are important differences of emphasis here, there is no clear difference of doctrine. The Conference could report that "on the doctrines of God the Father, the Person and work of Christ, the Person and mission of the Holy Spirit, the Trinity, and the Life Everlasting we have found nothing which separates any one of these Communions from another."

Professor Micklem views the matter of church union very soberly.

We find in his article nothing of the "unite-or-bust" stress which characterizes so many union movements in other areas. He writes:

It is impossible to predict what will be the outcome of the labors of this Joint Conference. What would be involved in implementing the Archbishop's suggestion is now plain. There is bound to be strong,

even violent, conscientious objection from those whom I may describe without prejudice as the more extreme elements on both sides. There will be a large central body of opinion which will hold that these proposals [of the Joint Conference] deserve the most careful and prayerful consideration of all the Churches; for the spiritual prize of Table Fellowship [altar fellowship], which would imply the virtual healing of the old estrangement and the ending of a great scandal, is worth the loss of many cherished habits and many conventional ideas if only it can be achieved without violence done to principle.

The writer's final paragraph shows a deep insight into the present-day church and world situation and will no doubt find many sympathetic listeners. He says:

The theologians and ecclesiastics who sponsor this Report have done their best. But perhaps in the wisdom of God church unity will not be achieved by the principles of theologians or the devices of ecclesiastics, but by force of circumstance. For sixteen hundred years Christ's Church has enjoyed great prestige in the West. In more recent years it has enjoyed in Asia and Africa such prestige as came from its association with the technical civilization of the West. Already in Europe and Asia political power and social planning are passing more and more into the hands of the hitherto unprivileged classes which, where they are not anti-religious, tend to be unsympathetic toward religion. It looks as if the Church will be stripped of prestige, of political power, and of accumulated wealth. In many countries it may well be reduced to companies gathering in private houses, as at the first, or to Christian "cells"; nor should such a development in any degree be regarded as a disaster. Where the Church would consist of little groups in covenant with one another and their Lord, the Congregational conception of the essence of the Church might (so far) find its vindication and acceptance. But it would soon be regarded as vital that such groups be linked together by personal ties and a common confession. We might predict that before long there would be found, as in the first centuries of church history, a local episcopate and some common simple creed, and Anglicanism would find a certain vindication. But since it is certain that such Christian "cells" and household churches would need pastoral care and leadership, we might anticipate the appearance of an ordained lay eldership and thus the vindication of the Presbyterian tradition.

This is no prophecy of what will happen, but a reminder of what may happen. We may hope that the cause of Christian unity may be greatly furthered by the publication of this Joint Report; but if it should fail of its purpose and none should be persuaded, God will reunite us in His own time and His own better way. J. T. MUELLER

WHEN LOVE LEAPS RELIGIOUS BARRIERS

Under this heading, Rabbi J. L. Fink in the *Jewish Layman* (January, 1951) voices his opinion on marriages involving Jews and non-Jews. He admits that "Reform Judaism boasts of its liberalism," but warns that "its passion for latitude of thought does not justify conduct which leads to self-destruction." He argues: "Liberal in thinking though we are, we cannot neutrally preside over our own liquidation as a people and as a faith, which is precisely what widespread intermarriage would mean."

According to Rabbi Fink, "when a Jew marries someone from outside the Jewish community, he or she contracts either a mixed marriage or an intermarriage. In a mixed marriage the non-Jewish member of the marriage remains unconverted to Judaism. Mixed marriage is clearly unpromising in its prospects of happiness for both parties to the marriage and, what is more important, it is clearly a suicidal trend as far as our peoplehood is concerned. All the currents of Jewish history, tradition, and law move against both the promise of happiness in, and also the performance of mixed marriages. The Central Conference of American Rabbis on more than one occasion affirmed its opposition to mixed marriages, resolving that 'mixed marriages are contrary to the tradition of the Jewish religion and should therefore be discouraged by the American Rabbinate.' Few if any rabbis will officiate at such marriages, for they are banned in every wing of Judaism."

This warning the rabbi regards as necessary because "in some communities, particularly in smaller communities of long-established families, marriage with non-Jews is reaching menacing proportions. The growing tendency of Jewish life in a small community is for Jews to intermingle socially with their non-Jewish neighbors, and people who intermingle often intermarry. As long as this process continues, there is no check on the complete assimilation of a considerable portion of the Jewish population."

But "there is a ray of hope in this situation," the writer thinks, "in intermarriage as against mixed marriage. In intermarriage the non-Jewish partner accepts the Jewish faith. Lip service to Judaism from the non-Jew does not qualify him or her for intermarriage; nothing short of a genuine conversion to Judaism qualifies him. . . . The conversion to Judaism on the part of the non-Jewish partner to an intermarriage must be completely sincere and permanent, lest the intermarriage degenerate into a mixed marriage."

For this reason rabbis, before solemnizing an intermarriage, must insist upon the thorough Jewish training and education of the non-Jews,

which "will wipe out all theological differences between husband and wife." To this he adds: "We do not encourage intermarriage, but we accept it when it comes. Wisely guided, it can become a source of strength for our people instead of a cause of weakness."

There is sound advice, *mutatis mutandis*, in the writer's closing words: "One of our major problems today is to instill enough Jewish consciousness and loyalty into our young people to make them want to choose helpmates who were born into Judaism. But when we fail, when love leaps religious barriers, and young people seek to intermarry, the parents and rabbis must make the ceremony of conversion the most vital, significant, and whole-souled ceremony in the life of the proselyte. If a so-called conversion is accepted as a concession, endured with an artificial formality, in order to attain the goal of marriage, and therefore to be forgotten, then it will be meaningless, deceptive, and, worse yet, destructive of Jewish loyalties. Yielding to such a misnamed conversion emphasizes in a most repugnant manner the use of hypocrisy to attain marriage. The essence of successful intermarriage is in the honesty, the good faith, and the constancy of the convert to Judaism. I have seen it work successfully many times, and I recommend it as our sole and helpful solution to this vexatious question."

J. T. MUELLER

ITEMS FROM "RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE"

The number of members in the Lutheran churches of all synods in the Washington, D. C., metropolitan area has increased from 14,206 to 22,024 in the period 1943 to 1950. The United Lutheran Church still maintains its lead with 11,605 members, a gain of 2,695 since 1943. Membership in the churches of the Missouri Synod during the seven-year period has climbed from 2,208 to 4,952. The American Lutheran congregations have increased their membership from 2,526 to 4,589. The one church of the Augustana Synod has grown from 562 to 878.

The Southern Baptist Sunday School Board was exceedingly prolific last year in issuing study and reading materials. Nearly 55,000,000 pieces of literature rolled off their presses. Among this mass of reading matter there were 43,668,750 periodicals, 8,405,000 tracts, 498,670 new books, 1,808,919 reprints of old books, and 603,418 record books.

The Soviet State publishing house in Moscow has issued a new Russian dictionary, containing explanations—all strictly materialistic—for 20,000 foreign words and phrases. In defining the word "Bible," the dictionary says: "The Bible is a collection of fantastic legends

without any scientific support. It is full of dark hints, historical mistakes, and contradictions. It serves as a factor for gaining power and subjugating the unknowing nations." The word "religion" receives more consideration. The dictionary definition says: "Religion is a fantastic faith in God's angels and spirits. It is a faith without any scientific foundation. Religion is being supported and maintained by the reactionary circles. It serves for the subjugation of the working people and for building up the power of the exploiting bourgeois classes. The liquidation of the bourgeois society and the advent of the communist system has destroyed the foundations of religion and is putting the laws of natural science in place of the cunning lies which are being advertised by all religions. The superstition of outlived religion has been surmounted by the communist education of the working class, by its active participation in the construction of the free, socialistic life, and by its deep knowledge of the scientifically profound teachings of Marx-Leninism."

Mormons in California are making preparations for the erection of a two-million-dollar temple in Los Angeles which will exceed in size the famous temple of Salt Lake City.

Over 2,500 Protestant clergymen have filed a motion with the U.S. Supreme Court in which they ask permission to submit a brief as "Friends of the Court" in support of Dr. John Howard Melish, ousted rector of Holy Trinity Church in Brooklyn, N.Y. In the petition we read: "The doctrine of separation of Church and State presented by this case involves much more than the destinies of the petitioners or of the particular religious organization to which they belong. The clergy presenting this one seek an opportunity to defend all religious beliefs from the invasion of civil authority, and specifically, to establish the principle that in matters affecting the affairs of a religious organization, the State may not either directly or indirectly provide rules or penalties where the religious organization has provided its own rules for the management of its affairs and the solution of controversies within its organization, and its own penalties for a breach thereof. The ruling of the Court below is founded on and tends to establish a rule of law that a civil court may by injunction enforce an ecclesiastical judgment disregarding the specific method of enforcement provided by the canons of the particular religious organization. To permit such a rule or law to prevail would breach the wall between church and state which—as this Court has said—must be kept high and impregnable. It would grant to the civil court the authority to make such rules as in its discretion it might deem desirable, irrespective

of the canons and the wishes of the religious organization or of the contract by which members and clergy banded together. Enforcement by a civil court of an ecclesiastical judgment by methods inconsistent with those provided by the laws of the church is, we submit, a violation of the First Amendment of our Constitution. The issuance of an injunction by the trial court to enforce an ecclesiastical judgment on the pain of imprisonment for contempt was a direct invasion by the civil authority of the religious liberty guaranteed by the Amendment."

The Polish parliament abolished five present Roman Catholic holidays as non-working days. Hereafter the Polish Communist government will recognize only twelve non-working days in a year, including Communist national holidays. Sunday is not considered a non-working day.

In addressing the Evangelical Press Association, Professor Roland T. Wolseley pleaded for more effective journalism techniques in church papers. He listed the following points as major shortcomings of the present religious press: (1) failure to utilize the best techniques within the budget set up; (2) the frequent use of undocumented and unproved assertions; (3) dull writing; (4) stock religious language and clichés which do not convey much meaning to the general public.

Radio Station WRUL of the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation in Boston is broadcasting Scripture readings in the Russian language each Sunday on the station's European beam at 3:00 P.M. Eastern Standard Time. The Scripture selections are chosen to bring out such ideas as humility, mercy, "God is love," prayer, and the Commandments.

The United Lutheran Church in America will conduct a school on marriage and family relations at Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, June 18—22. About 175 pastors and laymen from United Lutheran synods throughout the United States and Canada are expected to attend and will be trained as instructors in marriage and family life problems. Discussions will center on the effect that war, mobilization, divorce, and other factors have on family life and marriage.

At a special service in Oslo, attended by members of the Norwegian royal family and a group of leading church and State dignitaries, Dr. Eivind Berggrav preached his last sermon as Bishop of Oslo and Primate of the Norwegian State Lutheran Church. Dr. Berggrav intends to devote a good deal of his remaining time to promoting the ecumenical movement as one of the six presidents of the World Council of Churches.

BOOK REVIEW

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 South Jefferson Avenue, St. Louis 18, Missouri.

INTRODUCING THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Clyde T. Francisco. Broadman Press, c. 1950, Nashville, Tenn., xii and 271 pages, 5¾×8¼. \$3.75.

Anyone who knew and used John R. Sampey's book *Syllabus for Old Testament Study* will be glad to hear that it is, in effect, reappearing under this new title and by a successor of the former author at Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, Ky.

Like the former textbook, *Introducing the Old Testament* does not "deal in the technicalities of scholarly research," but wants "to acquaint the average reader with the essential history and teachings of the Old Testament" and "to be helpful to the Sunday school teacher, interested layman, college student, or seminary beginner" (p.ix). The framework also remains the same. However, there are new and added features in the revision which in many respects enhance its value. Thus there is a new chapter on "The Nature of the Old Testament," which includes a history of the text and the canon of the Old Testament. The isagogical material receives somewhat fuller treatment and is brought up to date. The same holds true of the short explanatory or exegetical notes attached to each book of the Old Testament.

The new book, like its predecessor, is a conservative study. However, a different tone is noticeable in *Introducing the Old Testament* from that of Sampey's book. In the general presentation the author at times seems to lean in the direction of the higher-critical viewpoint. Thus he frequently brushes aside the question of the authorship of the book (or part of a book) as inconsequential with the remark that the really essential question is: What does the book in the form that we have it now teach us? However, in some instances authorship is of importance. Did Moses write the book of Deuteronomy, or does it contain Mosaic material "edited by the prophetic party under the inspiration of God" (p.40) in 621 B.C.? Did God speak in this book before 621 B.C., or was it first "regarded as divinely inspired when it was found in 621 B.C."? (P.10.) The same holds true of the treatment of such books as Jonah, Isaiah, Zephaniah, Daniel. It is true, the author presents both views, but the reader cannot help feeling that he is tipping the scales unnecessarily in favor of the liberal position.

This feeling is confirmed when one reads such a statement as: "Ezekiel is also distinguished from the other Old Testament prophets by the special prominence of the pathological element in his prophecy" (p.160).

President Fuller writes in the Preface: "This is the first book to come

from the pen of this author, but it will not be the last" (Preface, p. vii). To present an introduction to the whole Old Testament is an ambitious undertaking for a young instructor. The writer has a fine grasp of the material and is well acquainted with the pertinent literature. We hope that further study and experience will enable him to reach a more satisfying synthesis of historical studies with his own conservative viewpoint.

WALTER R. ROEHRS

THE GILGAMESH EPIC AND OLD TESTAMENT PARALLELS. Second Edition. By Alexander Heidel. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1949. 269 pages, 7×9½. \$5.00.

This new edition of Dr. Heidel's work differs little from the first which appeared on the market in 1946 except for very few improvements in the translation and an occasional revision of the references, which were called for by the results of later research. That no greater changes were necessary is not surprising, since the author, who is completely at home in the field of Assyriology, put a vast amount of painstaking research into the first edition, something which gave assurance that his translation of the Epic and of all known related texts would remain practically final until some new text materials became available to fill in the still numerous remaining gaps.

For the benefit of such as may not have any acquaintance with Dr. Heidel's book a brief overview of its contents may be in place. The author presents his work in four chapters, chapters one, three, and four making up the bulk of the volume. Chapter one, about one hundred pages, after a brief account of the discovery of the tablets in the ruins of ancient Nineveh and their publication, is devoted to a summary of the story followed by a scholarly translation of the Assyrian text which, in the guise of an epic, deals with the problem of death and of life after death. Chapter two presents related materials, such as very ancient versions of the Deluge in the Sumerian language, in the so-called Atrachasis Epic, and in Berossus' History of Babylonia. In chapter three Dr. Heidel examines in detail the views of the Babylonians and Assyrians in regard to death and, particularly, life after death and compares the statements of the Old Testament on the same subjects. The final chapter is devoted to the Flood story in the Gilgamesh Epic and its Old Testament counterpart. Throughout the entire volume Dr. Heidel maintains a conservative Lutheran position coupled with sound scholarship. To be a scholar and a conservative Lutheran is not incompatible. The book merits careful study by students of the Old Testament.

G. V. SCHICK

CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. By T. W. Callaway. Loizeaux Brothers, New York, c. 1950. 190 pages, 5×7½. \$2.25.

The title of this book is very inviting. It is also very satisfying to discover that the author is a staunch believer in the inspiration of the Bible and in the deity of Christ.

However, it is disappointing to find his presentation utterly inadequate. At best it is a conglomeration of pious thoughts, many of which lack Biblical basis. The writer lacks the scholarly equipment to cope with the subject. Just one example: "Jehovah (Hebrew, *Yah-Yahweh*; Greek, *Jesus*; English, *Jesus*)," p. 17. The conservative viewpoint cannot stand on such a ludicrous basis.

WALTER R. ROEHRS

THE UNITY OF ISAIAH. By Oswald T. Allis. The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, 1950. 134 pages, 6×1¼ by 9¼. \$2.25.

The multiple authorship of the book of Isaiah is considered so well established by so many Old Testament scholars that the claim is made: "Today practically all reputable scholars accept the Exilic origin of Deutero-Isaiah."

Here is a book whose author adds to his reputation as a scholar by upholding the unity of the book of Isaiah. He has the experience and the background of Old Testament learning that makes him not only "reputable," but outstanding among Bible students today. Dr. O. T. Allis was for many years instructor, assistant professor, and professor in the Old Testament department of Westminster Theological Seminary. He was and is active in literary production: Faculty Editor of the *Princeton Theological Review*, Associate Editor and Editorial Correspondent of the *Evangelical Quarterly* (Edinburgh), author of *The Five Books of Moses, Prophecy and the Church, Revision* (R. S. V.) or *New Translation*?

In his new book he raises his voice against this "most assured result of modern Biblical scholarship" (the division of Isaiah) in a manner that should cause many "reputable" scholars to engage in a little re-examination and, above all, in a little self-examination as to whether they want to remain in the Christian and Biblical tradition or whether they want to operate as humanistic philosophers.

For that is the alternative that Dr. Allis presents. And that, too, is the strength of this little book. To take up all the arguments that have been advanced for the division of Isaiah would require a very sizable book. In his *Five Books of Moses* he reduced the problem of Mosaic authorship to the question: "What think ye of Christ?" Here he presses a similar basic question: "What is prophecy? What is Messianic prophecy?"

He asserts that the main reason for the division of Isaiah rests upon a concept of prophecy which is not Biblical. His thesis is that everyone who denies the prediction of Cyrus also rejects (or should do so to be consistent) every Messianic prophecy of the Old Testament and its fulfillment in the New Testament. Cyrus and the Servant, he says, cannot be dealt with on two levels: the one local and present, the other distant and future, unless one is prepared to make also of the New Testament and its interpretations of the Old Testament a mere human book and to reduce even the New Testament promises for the future to a "philosophical problem."

There can be no doubt of the validity of Dr. Allis's assertion that the demand for detaching Isaiah 40—66 from the first part of the book and moving it several centuries ahead in time stems, to a great extent, from the modern critical view of prophecy as a message to contemporaries about contemporary events.

Can a person who believes in "the Biblical view of prophecy" and in an unequivocal inspiration of the Bible in general, still hold that not all of the sixty-six chapters of Isaiah flowed from the same pen? Dr. Allis does not elaborate on this question, except that he mentions the manner of the New Testament quotations from Isaiah as precluding any possibility of a multiple authorship.

WALTER R. ROEHRS

THE LETTERS OF ST. PAUL TO SEVEN CHURCHES AND THREE FRIENDS WITH THE LETTER TO THE HEBREWS. Translated by Arthur S. Way, M.A. 8th edition. Chicago, Moody Press, 1950. 228 pages, 5½×8. \$2.50.

This translation of a part of the New Testament was first published in 1901. Originally Hebrews was not included; it was added in the second edition, which appeared in 1906. The author, Arthur S. Way (b. 1847, d. 1930) was a British scholar of distinction who made his mark as a translator of Greek and Latin classics, such as the *Odyssey* of Homer, plays of Euripides, and the *Odes* of Horace. The principles which guided him in the latter field he applied when he undertook to render the Letters of Paul. Whoever has read the Greek and Latin classics in translation, as they are presented, f.i., in the Loeb Classical Library, will have noticed that the translators anxiously avoid extremely literal renderings and always endeavor to give the thought of the ancient author in good and often elegant English. Way succeeded in putting the Letters of Paul into such a dress. His version will be considered free and often constitutes a paraphrase, but I think he succeeds remarkably well in placing the thought of the Apostle before us in excellent English. Let me quote his rendering of Gal. 1:6-11: "I am simply amazed to find you so suddenly deserting Him who invited you to share the grace of Messiah, deserting to what is in fact an opposition Glad-tidings, not an alternative one — unless, indeed, we are to allow that these men carry any real weight, these men who are trying to unsettle you, and who would fain distort the glad tidings of Messiah into something different. I tell you, even if I — even if an angel from heaven should come bearing to you a Glad-tidings at variance with that which I first proclaimed to you, let him be accursed! I have said this before, I say it again now — if anyone is proclaiming a message to you at variance with that which you first received, accursed be he. Am I now — as my enemies accuse me of doing — waiting for man's approval, or for God's? Am I angling for popularity? No, if I still sought popularity with men, no bondservant of Messiah should I be." On account of our discussions of Rom. 16:17 f. I insert his translation of these two verses: "Now

I beg of you, my brothers, to be on your guard against the men who are exciting those notorious dissensions, and putting those obstructions in the path of believers, all contrary to the teaching which you received. Shun them. Such men are no bondmen of our Lord Messiah: they are slaves of their own base appetites; and by their sanctimonious cant they delude the hearts of guileless people." The Epistles are always prefaced by a little introduction giving information on the date and place of the Letter's origin. A chronology of the Life and Letters of St. Paul is prefixed, containing in the main the dates adopted by Coneybeare and Howson. W. ARNDT

EXPLANATION OF THE BOOK OF REVELATION. By C. H. Little. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 232 pages, 6×8. \$2.75.

If you search for a commentary that answers all your questions pertaining to the Book of Revelation, this is not the book you are looking for. To be candid, it is to be doubted that you will ever find such a work. But if you desire to own an explanation of the Apocalypse which in its various interpretations does not violate the analogy of faith, here you have it. Dr. Little in this work measures up to what we expect of him. This 79-year-old theologian is known as a sturdy Lutheran scholar whose Tennessee Synod ancestry is not belied by the positions he sets forth and defends.

After these opening remarks the reader will not find it strange to be informed that Dr. Little supports the Apostolic authorship of Revelation and that he altogether rejects anything that might savor of chiliastic propensities.

When the interpretation of details is examined, one fact will strike the student as a special characteristic of this work: The author endeavors to remain general and avoids as much as possible identifying the figures and symbols of this prophetic book with specific personages and events. The explanation of the mysterious number 666 in 13:18 can here be cited. "This number is . . . symbolical. This is the number of incompleteness; and this number plus its multiple by ten, plus its multiple by ten times ten, expresses intensified incompleteness, as falling short three times of the number 7, which is the number of God, including Christ and all His grace and salvation for men. 666, on the other hand, is the number of the antichristian world power, stamping the earth-dwellers as entirely outside the Kingdom of God and His Christ, and as doomed to final and complete defeat. The number 666 is not cabalistic or cryptic. It does not refer to any one individual, but to the world-wide opposition to God and His cause, characterizing all who bear this mark as belonging to the dragon and his kingdom of darkness" (p. 138).

On the same page an explanation is given of the two beasts brought before us in chap. 13. "In this chapter the first beast represents the whole antichristian power throughout the world. The second beast, who is in the service of the first beast, represents the whole antichristian prop-

aganda that is carried on in the world. The first beast personifies ferocious power. The second beast personifies deceptive propaganda." The identity of the two witnesses 11:3 is another case in point. Who are they? Dr. Little says: "The question naturally arises: Who are they whom the Lord here designates in the expression 'my two witnesses'? In answer we may say: This certainly does not refer to two actual men, whether Enoch and Elijah, or Moses and Elijah, as some commentators conjecture. It is well known to readers of the Bible that, for the establishment of the truth on any matter brought forward for judgment, at least two witnesses are required (cf. Deut. 17:6; 19:15; Matt. 18:16; John 8:17). It is in this sense, therefore, that this expression is used here. These two witnesses typify the believing congregation or the Church of true believers, which ever bears witness of Christ to the whole world. These two witnesses supplied by the Lord bear testimony that cannot be set aside without bringing condemnation upon all who reject their witness. And when it is said here that they shall prophesy, the meaning is that their witnessing is not mere human testimony, but that of divinely commissioned prophets. They testify to Christ's own Word, to the contents of the little book held open in the angel's right hand" (p. 106 f.).

A question that our readers quite certainly will ask, as they page through this book, is, Who is the angel that flies through the heavens according to Rev. 14:6? In spite of his uncompromising Lutheranism, the author does not identify this angel with the great Reformer. He says: "Some authors have taken the word 'angel' here as symbolical and have interpreted this vision as referring to Luther; but, as we have already noted, the term 'angel' is never used symbolically in the Apocalypse, although it is occasionally used in its original sense as 'messenger.' But, while Luther did indeed preach the pure Gospel and set it upon its golden candlestick in the Church again, he is not to be identified with this angel who is the messenger from heaven for the whole New Testament dispensation. His work is not to be restricted to Luther or the Reformation period, but includes the proclamation of the blessed Gospel message through all time" (p. 144). A passage where many an otherwise sound interpreter has gone astray is Revelation 20 with its reference to a thousand years of peace. Dr. Little says about it: "This 'thousand years,' a round number, is not to be taken literally, but symbolically in accord with the imagery with which it is surrounded. It stands here for the present dispensation, or the period of Messianic reign (cf. Heb. 2:14-15; 1 John 3:8), till near its close, when Satan shall be loosed again for a little time (v. 3), and shall go forth to deceive the nations that are in the four corners of the earth (v. 7)" (p. 202). The excerpts show that the comments of Dr. Little are always brief, straightforward, devoid of superfluous rhetoric. On some passages probably more detailed exegesis should have been submitted; the reader now and then wishes that some of the "obscurities" of the Apocalypse would have been treated at greater length.

But all in all, we are here dealing with an excellent work which will render valuable service, especially in these turbulent times which have all the characteristics assigned in the Scriptures to the last days.

W. ARNDT

DAS CHRISTLICHE ETHOS. Grundlinien der lutherischen Ethik, von Werner Elert, D. Dr., o. Professor an der Universitaet Erlangen. Furche-Verlag, Tuebingen. 595 pages, $5\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{3}{4}$. Leinwand, DM. 18; brosch. DM. 15.

This book raises a fundamental question: Can Lutheran theology ever view Christian ethics as an independent theological discipline or even treat it as a separate section of dogmatics, since in Lutheran theology ethics can be no more than an expansion of the entire *locus* discussed in dogmatics under Sanctification? The Roman Catholic Church, with its atomistic view of sin and sanctification, is compelled to view Christian ethics as a separate branch of theology under the heading "Moral Theology." Calvinism, which has made the third use of the Law the *proprius usus*, also requires an ethics, an ethics based on "a demanding law." True, in our complex society the Christians' consciences must be quickened to make the right decisions in the many personal and social problems which confront them, and our Christians seek guiding principles for Christian conduct. But this must be done solely on the basis of the Gospel.

Dr. Elert is primarily a historical dogmatician, and this is reflected in his book, which in the final analysis is a dogmatical treatise on the Distinction of Law and Gospel, "the special brilliant light of the Reformation." He is the author of *Die Morphologie des Luthertums* and *Der Christliche Glaube*, one of the best German Lutheran dogmatics. The reviewer met him in his study on the very day in 1946 on which his home was returned to him by the government after it had been occupied by Polish DP's. (What a sight!) In 1948 he was one of the co-essayists at the Bad Boll Free Conference.

The treatise is divided into three chapters: 1. Ethics under the Law; 2. Ethics under the Gospel; 3. Objective Ethics. The author has succeeded exceptionally well to present a genuinely Lutheran approach to the distinction between ethics under the Law and under Grace. There is no least common denominator in ethics applicable to both the Christian and the non-Christian. Among other things Elert points out that as *peccator* the Christian is totally under the Law with its mandatory and punitive character. As *iusus* he is totally under the creative and regenerative power of the Holy Spirit. There is no point at which these two "ethics" can ever meet. An ethos under the Law is based on a radically wrong concept of the image of God. In a Law-ethics man forms his own image of God and attempts to become the "measure of all things" and therefore fails completely to understand the Law as Law. He does not know the Scriptural axiom: *Lex semper accusat*, that is, God's Law is always God's

judgment and condemnation. Man, viewing ethics under the Law, atomizes the Law into so and so many commandments and prohibitions. What is most fatal is that he believes the Law to have as its primary purpose a standard by which man can work out his own destiny. An ethics under the Law does not know sin, original sin. Elert points out that the German word "*Erbsuende*" occurs for the first time in the writings of Geiler von Kaisersberg (d. 1510). This term is misunderstood when man views "inherited sin" as something which he can accept or reject as any other inheritance. Elert believes, and we fully agree with him, that Luther's definition of "*Erbsuende*" as "*Hauptsuende*," "*Personensuende*," is much better, because it reveals this sin as man's *total* rebellion against God. Because of his "*Hauptsuende*" man who has lived under the condemning Law of God also dies in rebellion. Luther understands original sin as man's attempt to justify himself by attempting to deny that God is God and by placing himself in the stead of God. Here, as Elert points out, Luther's definition of sin breaks sharply, distinctly, and completely from that of his theological predecessors down to Augustine. Sin cannot be defined, it can only be experienced in the anxiety and helplessness of an awakened conscience. Animals die guiltless; man, however, lives and dies in guilt. These are truths that need to be emphasized today, for in spite of the catastrophic events of recent years man's complacency has not been shattered. And Elert, in using Luther extensively, states these truths effectively and challengingly. In this chapter there are many illuminating and thought-provoking sections, each of which constitutes a study in itself. He discusses among other things individual responsibility and collectivism; in God's sight no human being exists with the mere designation of N.N., for every man is an individually responsible personality.

In the second chapter, "*Ethos unter der Gnade*," Elert discusses (1) The Encounter with Christ; (2) The New Creature; (3) The New Obedience; (4) The Invisible Conflict. Each of these sections is a gem and deserves careful study. Space does not permit us to give a résumé, and we must be content to refer to a few samples to show the author's approach. Speaking on the *Wagnis der Werke* (the daring adventure of good works), Elert quotes Kierkegaard on Abraham's dilemma when commanded to sacrifice his son. Kierkegaard views the tension in the collision of two commandments and finds Abraham's solution of the paradox in this, that his "faith" suspends the Law which is applicable to all and accepts the specific commandment. In answer, Elert refers to Luther's explanation of Abraham's dilemma. Abraham does not see two conflicting commandments, but a conflict between God's commandment to kill Isaac (the Law) and His promise to bless all nations through Isaac (Gospel). In this terrific tension, Abraham's faith ignores, as it were, God's commandment (the Law) and trusts fully and implicitly in God's promise (the Gospel). Probably the most illuminating section of this

chapter is the treatment of the "invisible conflict." Elert points out that Lutheran theology here shows its truly dialectical character, for there is a real conflict between the old Adam and the new man, which is not solved by a paradox, as "dialectical theology" would have us believe. "The two ways," "the two times," "the two realms," place the total person under the Law, so that the total person lives under the judging and condemning power of the Law and again the total person lives only by God's grace in Christ Jesus. It is at this point where in the reviewer's opinion Elert reaches the climax of his book and of Lutheran theology. For that reason the third chapter, "Objective Ethics," seems somewhat anticlimactic. This chapter deals with a description of the Church as a social entity in the world, and Elert comes to grips with the problems arising out of the inevitable collision of the two realms, which occurs not only in the individual's life, but also in society.

We found the volume very stimulating and thought-provoking. Elert's style is vivid, plastic, and, for those who have at least a modicum of German *Sprachgefuehl*, not too difficult. Each of the 63 subheads has an extensive bibliography; including, for example, A. W. Meyer, "What Is Conscience?" in *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, 1934. Elert has not answered all questions in the area of his treatise. Further study must be given to such questions as: Does the Natural Law convict the sinner of sin as a rebellion against God? What is Christ's *opus alienum*?

F. E. MAYER

FIFTY YEARS OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY. By Carl F. H. Henry. W. A. Wilde Co., Boston, Mass. 113 pages, 8×5½. \$1.50.

THE THEOLOGY OF REINHOLD NIEBUHR. By Edward J. Carnell. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. 250 pages, 9×6. \$3.50.

Dr. E. J. Carnell is professor of Apologetics of Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, Calif., at which school of theology Dr. C. F. H. Henry is professor of Philosophy of Religion. Both teachers are members of the Evangelical Theological Society, founded in Cincinnati in 1949 for witnessing in general against the various forms of liberalism prevalent in our time and for supplying a "competent literature reflective of the Biblical outlook." Dr. Henry's monograph grew out of his essay read at Cincinnati on the subject that forms the title of his book. The Biblical scholar cannot but read it sympathetically and appreciatively. Of necessity the work is in part somewhat sketchy. The average reader will hardly grasp its terse delineations unless he consults more comprehensive works on the subject. Should there be a second edition, the author might add more meat to the somewhat bare outline of his dogmatico-historical treatise. It is nevertheless a helpful guide and as an overview of the theology of the past half century it forms a valuable contribution to modern conservative apologetic literature.

Of greater scholarship, though more narrow in its scope, is Dr. Carnell's evaluation of Reinhold Niebuhr's theology, though it deals in the main with the dialectical relation between time and eternity as the controlling concept of Niebuhr's theological thinking. The author sees in Niebuhr's theology a remarkable synthesis of Continental pessimism and American liberal optimism. Niebuhr in his opinion is the outstanding leader of American dialectical theology, who has crystallized neo-orthodox thought into a system. The book is divided into four parts: "The Background for the Dialectical Theology," "The Construction of Dialectical Theology," "The Christian Dialectic," "Concluding Implications: *Agape* and the Realm of Culture." The subject with which Dr. Carnell deals is of course difficult, and the reader, before venturing upon this monograph, should be acquainted at least with the elementary principles of dialectic theology. Dr. Carnell, however, puts his evaluations as simply and intelligibly as this can be done.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

EVANGELISCHES GUTACHTEN ZUR DOGMATISIERUNG DER LEIBLICHEN HIMMELFAHRT MARIENS. Chr. Kaiser Verlag, Muenchen. 24 pages, 6×9. DM. 90.

Under the chairmanship of Dr. E. Schlink the theological faculty of the Heidelberg University prepared this theological opinion for joint discussion of Evangelical and Catholic theologians prior to the publication of the new dogma. But the Roman hierarchy completely and summarily ignored the theological and historical arguments and protests. Subsequently this opinion became the basis for the pastoral letter of the German Lutheran bishops, published in the February issue of this journal. F. E. MAYER

THE CRAFT OF SERMON ILLUSTRATION. A Source Book for Ministers. By W. E. Sangster. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1950. 5½×8, 125 pages. \$2.50.

Here is a thoroughly useful book on a subject which so frequently receives juvenile treatment. We have here in no wise a "compendium" of illustrations. Rather does the author, a British Methodist, give mature suggestions for developing the skill of illustrating preaching. He describes the functions, the types and sources, and the methods of remembering and using illustrations. With the exception of a theologically irritating quotation from Wesley, the book is all to the good and should get to work immediately in the practice of our parsons. RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

RENDER TO GOD. A Study of the Tribute Passage. By J. Spencer Kennard, Jr. Oxford University Press, 1950. 5¼×8, 148 pages. \$3.00.

With a mass of historical, numismatic, and theological documentation Dr. Kennard, a former teacher of theology in Japanese and Chinese Christian universities, seeks to maintain the position that the tribute money was in itself an act of idolatry. He asserts that "render unto Caesar the things

that are Caesar's" has religious significance in the mind of Jesus and is spoken either in irony, telling the chief priests that they should compound their felony of consorting with the Roman rule and bow to this idolatry; or in rebuke, saying in effect: "Do not render to Caesar a thing that does not belong to him, namely, a token that he is a god." "Render unto God the things that are God's" is, then, a comment on, and development of, the concept that men should acknowledge only the true God. The author believes that Christ thereby actually forbade giving tribute to Caesar, that this fact was reflected in the charges against Jesus at His trial, and that the Savior sought to establish a kingdom that involved the overthrow of the Roman rule. While the author bolsters his argument by hypothetical treatment of the Gospels and arrives at a conclusion at variance with the concept of the spiritual Kingdom, he does offer most stimulating suggestions about the meaning of the celebrated dictum of Our Lord on Caesar and God.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

THE CULTURAL CONCEPT OF CHRISTIANITY. By Arthur Wallace Calhoun. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1950. $5\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$, 155 pages. \$2.50.

In twenty-five brief chapters Dr. Calhoun, dean of the United Presbyterian Sterling College at Sterling, Kans., and author of books on sociology, develops the thesis that society to be alive must be "organismic," namely, not a collection of individuals, but an interrelation of individuals. The author seeks to relate the physical, social, and psychological sciences to this thesis. In this process the absoluteness of Christ as the Way to the Father, by the road of redemption and not merely of example, suffers. The author feels that the regeneration of the social order is the goal of the Gospel.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

BOOKS RECEIVED

From Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:

CONCORDIA BIBLE TEACHER. "The History of Israel." Part I, Vol. XII, No. 2. \$1.00 a year. — CONCORDIA BIBLE STUDENT. "The History of Israel." Part I, Vol. XI, No. 2. 65 cents a year. January to March, 1951. Edited by Rev. John M. Weidenschilling, S. T. D., under the auspices of the Board for Parish Education, The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod.

From Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York:

EVERYDAY RELIGION. By Joseph Fort Newton. $4\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$. 240 pages. \$1.25.

From Van Kampen Press, Wheaton, Ill.:

THE SABBATH AND THE LORD'S DAY. By Charles L. Feinberg. 5×7 . 32 pages. 25 cents.

EW

is
nd
ry;
oes
od
of,
nor
nat
nat
of
cal
he
es-
on

al-
60.

es-
on
,"
ls.
es
he
rs.
of

II,
of
1.
ne

s.

7.